

FINAL REPORT ON THE STUDY ON CRIME VICTIMISATION

INTERVICT
International
Victimology Institute
Tilburg

Final report on the study on crime victimisation

Contract: 11002-2008.002-2008.711

**Jan van Dijk
Pat Mayhew
John van Kesteren
Marcelo Aebi
Antonia Linde**

Tilburg, August 2010

Publisher: INTERVICT/PrismaPrint Tilburg
ISBN 978-94-6167-014-4

INTERVICT
Tilburg University
P.O. Box 90153
5000 LE Tilburg
Netherlands

Phone: +31 13 4663526
Fax: +31 13 4663546
E-mail: intervict@uvt.nl
Website: www.tilburguniversity.nl/intervict

Visiting address:
Montesquieu Building
Warandelaan 2
5037 AB Tilburg
Netherlands

INTERVICT is affiliated with Tilburg University

This research was commissioned by Eurostat.

Contents

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 THE POLICY OBJECTIVES OF AN EU SURVEY OF VICTIMISATION	1
1.2 THE INVENTORY OF SURVEY DATA ON VICTIMISATION	4
1.3 MODES OF INTERVIEW	4
2 KEY RESULTS OF THE 17-COUNTRY PILOTS	6
2.1 INTRODUCTION	6
2.2 MAIN IMPRESSIONS ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE	6
General recommendations about the questionnaire in the light of the pilots	8
2.3 SECTION A: PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION	8
Recommendations about personal and household information in the light of the pilots	8
2.4 SECTION B: FEELING OF SAFETY AND WORRIES ABOUT CRIME	9
Recommendations about feelings of safety and worry about crime	9
2.5 SECTION C: VICTIMISATION SCREENERS	9
Recommendations about victimisation screeners	10
2.6 SECTION D: VICTIM FORM ABOUT VICTIMISATION DETAILS	10
Recommendations about victimisation details	10
2.7 SECTION E: 'NON-CONVENTIONAL' CRIMES, INCLUDING E-CRIMES	11
Recommendations about 'non-conventional' crimes	11
2.8 SECTION F: OTHER SAFETY ISSUES	11
Recommendations about other safety issues	11
2.9 SECTION G: SEXUAL AND VIOLENT CRIMES	11
Recommendations about sexual and violent crimes	12
2.10 APPLIED METHODOLOGIES	12
2.11 ASSESSMENT OF COSTS	14
2.12 THE COUNTRIES' OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PILOTS	15
3 THE ICVS-2 PILOT SURVEYS	18
3.1 THE FIRST ICVS-2 PILOTS	18
3.2 THE SECOND ICVS-2 PILOTS	21
4 GENERAL ISSUES ABOUT SURVEY ADMINISTRATION	23
4.1 INTRODUCTION	23
4.2 MODE OF DATA COLLECTION	23
Recommendations on mode of data collection	27
4.3 LENGTH OF INTERVIEW	27
Recommendation on length of the questionnaire	27
4.4 FREESTANDING VERSUS MULTIPURPOSE VICTIMISATION SURVEYS	28
Recommendation on whether the survey should be freestanding	28
4.5 SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS	29
Recommendation on respondent selection	31
4.6 RECALL PERIOD AND TIMING OF FIELDWORK	31
Recommendation on the recall period and timing of fieldwork	32
4.7 SAMPLE SIZE	32
Recommendation on sample size	34

4.8	TRANSLATION.....	34
	Recommendations on translation	35
4.9	TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS, CONFIDENTIALITY AND ETHICS	36
	Recommendations on training of interviewers, confidentiality and ethics	39
4.10	TIME LIMIT FOR DATA TRANSMISSION.....	40
	Recommendations on data transmission.....	40
5	THE REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE.....	41
	Recommendations on a revised questionnaire.....	45

REFERENCES	46
ANNEX A MATRIX OF INFORMATION ON THE PILOT SURVEYS	47
ANNEX B PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SASU	59
ANNEX C EXPANDED QUESTIONS ON VIOLENCE FOR THE SASU	104
ANNEX D A review of victimisation surveys in Europe from 1970 to 2010.....	D-3

Tables

Table 1	Costs of surveys in different modes.....	15
Table 2	Summary of response rates in the first NICIS pilot	20
Table A.1	Interview modes, sample size, response rates, and duration	48
Table A.2	Sampling domain, sampling method, and respondent range.....	49
Table A.3	Executing and supervising agency, interviewer experience, gender and training.....	50
Table A.4	Modes of contact, re-contact and replacement, and incentives	51
Table A.5	Questionnaires changes, completion of Section G, and other comparisons	52
Table A.6	Salience and overall evaluation	53
Table A.7	Main criticisms and comments.....	55

Figures

Figure A	NICIS-I Pilot design for CAWI and PAPI modes	18
Figure B	Alternative options for questions about violence.....	42

Glossary

CAPI	Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing
CASI	Computer Assisted Self Interviewing
CATI	Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing
CAWI	Computer Assisted Web-based Interviewing
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EU-SPS	European Union Security Survey
FRA	Fundamental Rights Agency
HEUNI	The European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations
ICBS	International Crime Business Survey
ICCS	International Commercial Crime Survey
ICVS	International Crime Victimization Survey
NICIS	Netherlands's Institute for Urban Research and Practice
PAPI	Paper and Pencil Interviewing
SASU	EU Security Survey
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

ANNEX D - A review of victimisation surveys in Europe from 1970 to 2010

Marcelo F. Aebi & Antonia Linde
University of Lausanne, Switzerland*

Table of contents

Introduction	5
Methodology and terminology	5
Main European and international surveys on victimisation	7
ICVS	7
EU ICS	8
Eurobarometer	9
Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module	10
ICVS-2: Pilot studies	11
ICBS / ICCS	12
IVAWS	13
EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey	14
The pilot: FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants	14
The survey: EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey	15
Surveys on victimisation in the 27EU Members States	17
Austria (Österreich)	17
Belgium (Belgique/België)	18
Bulgaria (България [Bălgarija])	19
Cyprus (Κύπρος/Kıbrıs [Kýpros])	22
Czech Republic (Česká republika)	22
Denmark (Danmark)	24
Estonia (Eesti)	25
Finland (Suomi/Finland)	26
France (France)	28
Germany (Deutschland)	30
Greece (Ελλάδα [Elláda])	36
Hungary (Magyarország)	36
Ireland (Eire/Ireland)	37
Italy (Italia)	38
Latvia (Latvija)	40
Lithuania (Lietuva)	40
Luxembourg (Luxembourg)	41
Malta (Malta)	42
Netherlands (Nederland)	42
Poland (Polska)	44
Portugal (Portugal)	45
Romania (România)	46

*This paper is a revised and updated version of a report presented to Eurostat in June 2009 (Aebi & Linde, 2009). The authors would like to thank helpful comments and information provided by Jan van Dijk, John van Kesteren, Andri Ahven, Kauko Aromaa, Jacqueline Azzopardi, Markku Heiskanen, Fritz Huls, Georgeta Istrate, Andreas Kapardis, Klára Kerezsi, Milada Martinková, Maria Giuseppina Muratore, Louis de Schorlemer, Paul Smit, Wolfgang Stangl, Alexander Stoyanov, Cynthia Tavares, Geoffrey Thomas, Christina Zarafonitou, and Renée Zauberman.

Slovakia (Slovensko).....	47
Slovenia (Slovenija)	47
Spain (España)	48
National Level.....	48
Catalonia (Catalunya).....	50
Sweden (Sverige).....	51
Switzerland	52
United Kingdom.....	53
England and Wales	54
Northern Ireland	56
Scotland	56
Summary of the situation in Europe	58
Conclusion	67
References	69

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this review is to present the historical evolution and the current situation in respect of the collection of survey data on victimisation, at the European Union (EU) level and individually in each one of the 27 EU Member States from 1970 to 2010. The review includes national surveys, academic/research studies, pilot exercises, and international surveys. Whenever possible, the following information is provided for each survey: year in which the survey was conducted, frequency of the survey, type of survey (victimisation, multipurpose, etc.), questionnaire used (ICVS or ad hoc questionnaire), type of sample (national, city, etc.), size of the sample, response rate, methodology (face to face, CATI, CAPI, CAWI, CASI, PAPI, etc.), institution that financed the survey, and institution that conducted the survey. A chapter on victimisation surveys in Switzerland has also been included.

After a chapter on methodology and terminology, the review includes a short description of the main European and International Surveys mentioned frequently throughout the text (ICVS, EU ICS, Eurobarometer, Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module, Pilot studies of the ICVS-2, ICBS/ICCS, IVAWS, FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants, and EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey). The following 28 chapters present in detail the surveys conducted in each EU Member State and Switzerland. A synoptic table of the main surveys conducted in each EU country is provided at the end of the review.

METHODOLOGY AND TERMINOLOGY

To carry out this review, we followed three strategies. First, we took into account previous reviews, particularly the database developed by a working group of the UNECE/UNODC (2004-2006), a report submitted by HEUNI to Eurostat in 2007 (Aromaa, Heiskanen, Laaksonen & Viuhko, 2007), and the publications produced in the framework of the CRIMPREV program (Zauberman, 2009). Second, we conducted a comprehensive review of the existing scientific literature, official publications and reports, both through library networks and through the internet. Third, we took personal contact with colleagues and experts in the field of victimisation.

These strategies enabled us to build up a general bibliography and 27 specific bibliographies, one for each of the countries included in the review. The latter are mentioned in each of the relevant chapters. The general bibliography includes publications on the methodology and results of the main European and international surveys and has been used in different chapters of our review⁴⁵.

In order to avoid reiterations in the presentation of the different surveys, we applied the following conventions:

- (a) when the type of sample is not specified (e.g. urban sample), the sample is a national random sample

45 Alvazzi del Frate (1998, 2004a, 2004b), Alvazzi del Frate & van Kesteren (2002, 2004), Alvazzi del Frate, Zvekic & van Dijk (1993), Aromaa (2004), Aromaa & Heiskanen (2008), Aromaa, Heiskanen, Laaksonen & Viuhko (2007), De Schorlemer (2009), European Commission (1996, 2000, 2002), Eurostat (2009), FRA (2009), Goodey (2008), Johnson, Ollus & Nevala (2007, 2008), Mayhew & Van Dijk (1997), Nevala (2005), Smit (2009), Tavares (2009), Thomas (2007, 2009), UNECE-UNODC (2004-2006), Van Dijk (2009), Van Dijk & Langerak (2009), Van Dijk & Mayhew (1992), Van Dijk, Mayhew & Killias (1990), Van Dijk, Manchin, Van Kesteren & Hideg, G. (2007), Van Dijk & Steinmetz (1980), Van Dijk & Terlouw (1996), Van Dijk & Toornvliet (1996), Van Dijk, van Kesteren & Smit (2007), Van Kesteren (2003, 2009), Van Kesteren, Mayhew & Nieuwbeerta (2000), Zauberman (2008a, 2008b), Zvekic & Alvazzi del Frate (1995).

- (b) when the type of survey is not specified (e.g. multipurpose survey) the survey is a victimisation survey.
- (c) As a rule, the year of the survey corresponds to the one in which data were collected and not to the year used as a reference in the questionnaire, which usually is the previous one. For example, a 2010 survey usually covers the lifetime prevalence of victimisation experiences (which corresponds to the question: “Have you ever been the victim of...”) and the prevalence for the year 2009 (if the answer to the previous question is yes, when did that experience take place: this year [2010] last year [2009], or earlier?).
- (d) Sample size refers to the number of completed interviews (final sample). Whenever possible, we have indicated also the response rate. With these two elements it is possible to calculate the size of the gross sample (e.g. a sample size of 1,000 and a response rate of 50% means that the gross sample was 2000). When the final sample was not available, we have clearly indicated that we were mentioning the *gross sample*.

The following abbreviations have been used throughout the text:

Institutions:

- DG JLS: *Directorate-General for Justice, Freedom and Security of the European Commission*.
- EU: *European Union*.
- FRA: *European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights*.
- HEUNI: *European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations*.
- Nicis Institute for Urban Research and Practice.
- UNECE: *United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*.
- UNICRI: *United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute*.
- UNODC: *United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*.
- WODC: *Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice (Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum)*

Surveys:

- BCS: *British Crime Survey*.
- EU ICS: *EU International Crime Survey*.
- EU-MIDIS: *European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey*.
- ICBS: *International Crime against Businesses Survey*.
- ICCS: *International Crime Commercial Survey*.
- ICVS: *International Crime Victim Survey*.
- INSEC: *Insecurities in European Cities*.

Methods of sampling and interviewing:

- CAPI: *Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing*.
- CASI: *Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing*.
- CATI: *Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing*.
- CAWI: *Computer Assisted Web Interviewing*.
- FE : *Focused Enumeration*.
- FtoF: *Face to face Interviewing*.
- PAPI: *Pencil and Paper Interviewing*.
- PAPSI: *Pencil and Paper Self-Interviewing*
- RDD: *Random Digit Dialing*.
- RW: Random Walk = RR : Random Route.

MAIN EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL SURVEYS ON VICTIMISATION

In the following chapters we have compiled a few comprehensive descriptions of the main European and international surveys mentioned in this review.

ICVS⁴⁶

The International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) project was initiated in 1987⁴⁷. The main objective of the project was to seek advancement in international comparative criminological research, beyond the constraints of officially recorded crime data. The goal was to provide information on victimisation experiences, fear of crime, and attitudes towards the criminal justice system through a standard questionnaire, which would produce results allowing international comparisons. In order to reach that goal, all methodological aspects were standardised as much as possible.

The first round of the ICVS was conducted in 14 countries in 1989 by the Ministry of Justice of The Netherlands in cooperation with the Home Office of the United Kingdom and the University of Lausanne, Switzerland (Van Dijk, Mayhew, Killias, 1990). The interviews were conducted using CATI. The same year, pilot studies were conducted also in Indonesia (Jakarta) and Poland (Warsaw).

UNICRI became involved in the ICVS in 1991 with the aim of providing a wider geographical coverage to the project in order to include countries where telephone interviewing was not possible because the telephone penetration rates were low. A specific face to face methodology was developed for this purpose. Pilot studies were carried out to test the comparability of results obtained with the two different methods.

The second sweep of the ICVS took place in 1992 with a total of 33 participating countries, of which 20 used face to face interviews. The third sweep was performed in 1996 in 48 countries, of which 36 used face to face interviews. The fourth sweep was conducted in 2000 with, again, a total of 48 participating countries, of which 30 used face to face interviews. In 2004-5 took place the fifth sweep with 30 participating countries and including 33 capitals or main cities. As it is explained in the next chapter, in 18 countries, including the first 15 EU Member States, the survey was co-financed by the European Commission's Directorate General for Research and Technology Development and organised by a consortium lead by Gallup Europe. Until 2009, over 140 surveys have been conducted in 78 countries, of which 37 used national representative samples.

The first sweeps of the ICVS used samples of approximately 1,000 households, selecting individuals aged 16 or older. In 2004-5 the samples were usually of 2,000. These samples are relatively small by the standards of most national crime surveys; but they allow keeping the costs within reasonable limits. Comparative analyses can be safely conducted on the main variables, while caution should be the rule when looking at issues about which a small proportion of the sample provided information. Most countries using the CATI method draw national samples. The face to face method was used in countries

46 Sources: Alvazzi del Frate (2004b), van Dijk, van Kesteren & Smit (2007a).

47 The project was initiated by criminologists Martin Killias, Pat Mayhew and Jan van Dijk. The latter was also the main leader of the International Crime Businesses Survey (ICBS / ICCS), conducted for the first time in 1994. During the decade of 1990, UNICRI played a key role in the development of both surveys mainly through the work of Anna Alvazzi del Frate. The latter was also a member of the group of experts that, coordinated by HEUNI, launched in 1997 the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS).

where the telephone penetration rate was lower than 70%. In such cases, surveys were frequently conducted in urban areas, usually the capital city. In general, it can be said that industrialised countries, including all Western European countries used the CATI method, while face to face interviews were used by several Central and Eastern European countries, as well as in the capitals of countries of the Americas, Africa, and Asia.

The standard questionnaire has been translated in the languages of all participating countries. That questionnaire went through different modifications throughout the years, but the fundamental questions –especially the questions on victimisation experiences– remained almost identical in order to assure the continuity of the time series. The 2004-5 version (conducted, as explained below, under the name EU ICS in some countries) includes information on 15 offences. The types of offences included cover the bulk of *common crimes* such as theft, burglary, robbery and assault. Through a set of special questions the survey also collected information on nonconventional crimes such as petty corruption (bribe-seeking by public officials) and consumer fraud.

The time reference normally used in ICVS data analysis is the calendar year preceding the survey. On average, the response rate to the ICVS has been 60%. However, this percentage varied widely across time and from country to country. In particular, countries that used face to face interviews –generally in Central and Eastern Europe– managed sometimes to interview more than 90% of the households contacted, although this percentages have diminished to around 70% in 2004-5. On the other hand, in countries where the CATI method was used –generally in Western Europe–, response rates could vary between 30% and 80% in the 1990s, but went down to a range of 40%-60% in 2004-5.

EU ICS⁴⁸

The European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS, which corresponds to the abbreviation of EU International Crime Survey) was part of the fifth sweep of the ICVS. For the execution of the EU ICS in the member countries of the European Union a consortium was set up, led by Gallup Europe, in Brussels, and including UNICRI in Turin, Italy, the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg, Germany, CEPS/INSTEAD in Luxembourg and GeoX in Hungary. The consortium received a grant from the European Commission, DG Research, to carry out the EU ICS survey in 2005 among the 15 first Member States of the EU, and committed itself to include at least three of the newly acceded members (Estonia, Hungary, and Poland).

Most EU ICS interviews were carried out with CATI methodology; the exceptions were Estonia and Poland, where the interviews were conducted face to face in the respondent's home. In Finland, a sub-sample was interviewed via mobile phones. The average duration of the telephone interview was 23.2 minutes. Twelve of the countries were surveyed using an Internet-based CATI server that made the questionnaire available in many languages from a single location.

48 Source: van Dijk, Manchin, van Kesteren and Hideg (2005).

Eurobarometer⁴⁹

The Eurobarometer (EB) are a series of surveys regularly performed on behalf of the European Commission in EU Member States and, currently, in some European countries that do not belong to the EU or that are candidates to join the Union. The standard EB (there are, or there have been, other ones, such as the Flash EB, the Special EB, the EB qualitative, the Central and Eastern EB, and the Candidate Countries EB) was established in 1973 and is conducted twice yearly. In this article we will focus on the Standard EB 44.3 of 1996, which was the first one to include questions on fear of crime, as well as on the Standard EB 54.1 (Autumn 2000) and EB 58.1 (Autumn 2002) that also included questions related to victimisation.

The EB covers the population aged 15 and over, resident in each of the Member States, and uses a multi-stage random probability sample. The method consists in drawing a number of sampling points, proportional to population size and density and stratified by type of area (metropolitan, urban and rural). In each of the selected sampling points a starting address is drawn randomly. Further addresses are selected at every Nth address by standard random walk method. In each household, the respondent is selected randomly. All interviews are conducted face to face in the respondents' homes and in their national language. Data are weighted for gender, age and region. EU averages are calculated on the basis of Eurostat population figures. The usual sample size of the Eurobarometer is 1,000 in each country, with the exception of Germany (2,000 respondents, of whom 1,000 from the Western states and 1,000 from the Eastern states), the United Kingdom (1,300, of whom 1,000 from Great Britain and 300 from Northern Ireland) and Luxembourg (600). The small size of the sample is explained by the budget available and may have introduced bias that could lead to slightly inflated victimisation rates.

The Standard EB 44.3 (1996) included questions on the perception of the effectiveness of certain measures of crime prevention (alarm, reinforced doors, neighbourhood watch, policing), and the work of the police, individuals and organizations in prevention efforts. It also asked about the perception of the causes of juvenile delinquency (poverty, unemployment) and measures to reduce it (more discipline at homes and schools, tougher sentences, better education, prevention programs). The questionnaire included questions on the perception of organized crime, trying to establish if people felt that crime had infiltrated the civil society, the economy, and the local and national government. All these questions differ from those regularly included in the ICVS and were also included in the Standard Eurobarometer standard 58.1 in 2002. Furthermore, the Standard Eurobarometers 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) included a question about feeling safe while walking alone at night in the district of residence, and a question on contacts with drug-related problems in the neighbourhood. Finally, the Standard Eurobarometer 58.1 (2002) included questions on the perception of the risk of being victim of theft and robbery (making a distinction between theft, theft or robbery of mobile phones and theft or robbery of other personal items), burglary, and assaults or threats of assault.

In 1999, as part of the EB 51.0, a Special Eurobarometer entitled *Europeans and their Views on Domestic Violence against Women* was carried out. This opinion poll was conducted at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General

49 Source: van Dijk & Toornvliet (1996).

Communication, and was managed and organised by that Directorate-General Public Opinion Analysis Unit. For the Standard Eurobarometer 51.0, a total of 16,179 persons aged 15 and over, residents in the 15 EU Member States, were interviewed. The basic sampling design applied in all Member States was a multistage random sample. In each EU country, a number of sampling points was drawn with probability proportional to population size (for a total coverage of the country) and to population density. All interviews were face to face in people's home and in the appropriate national language (European Commission, 1999). In 2010, this Special Eurobarometer was repeated, as part of the EB 73.2, under the name of *Domestic Violence against Women* (n°344). It covered resident in each of the 27 Member States aged 15 and over with a total of 26,800 interviews. The same sampling procedure was applied. All interviews were conducted face to face in the appropriate national language and CAPI was used in those countries where this technique was available (European Commission, 2010).

Pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module⁵⁰

On 7th August 2006, the European Commission published the Commission Communication to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee on *Developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice: An EU Action Plan 2006-2010*. One of the most important activities identified in the Action Plan is the development of a common survey module on victimisation. The purpose of such a module is to ensure that information on crime victimisation could be collected in the Member States according to an agreed methodology and that the statistics would therefore be comparable.

In this context, Eurostat commissioned HEUNI for the development of a first draft of the module, which was then approved by the Working Group (Task Force) on victimisation surveys of Eurostat in June 2007. The module is based on victimisation surveys conducted both at the national and the international level, and takes into account the victimisation surveys database and the first version of the Manual on victimisation surveys developed by the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE).

Then the European Commission (Framework Programme of DG JLS) and Eurostat made available to Member States the necessary funds to conduct a pilot study of that module on victimisation. Sixteen countries and the Autonomous Community of Catalonia carried out the study through their Statistics institutes, between 2008 and 2010. The first part of the study consisted in translating the questionnaire and producing a report on major problems of translation; the second part consisted in applying the questionnaire to a selected sample in each country. The goal of the pilot study was to assess the viability of the module and to make recommendations for its implementation in line with the EU Action Plan. The evaluation of the pilot studies was commissioned by Eurostat to the Universities of Tilburg (Netherlands) and Lausanne (Switzerland) in December 2008 and was completed in June 2010.

Before conducting the fieldwork, participating countries were encouraged to carry out cognitive testing of the translated survey module using survey laboratory facilities where available. Each EU Member State was invited to make proposals for carrying out suitable testing procedures in a personal interview environment using a sample drawn from the

⁵⁰ Source: Eurostat (2009).

national population. The method of drawing the sample could be chosen by the Member State. Individuals may be selected, or households (all members of the household or only selected members). It was however important to ensure a roughly equal balance of men and women, and an adequate representation of young persons (aged under 25). The average sample size in each Member State was expected to be about a thousand individuals, depending on the costs involved.

Interviews could be conducted either face to face, using laptop computers (CAPI), or by telephone (CATI). It was recommended to use both methods for different sub-sets of the sample, in order to make it possible to assess the advantages and disadvantages of each mode for this type of survey module. Sections of the questionnaire on sensitive subjects such as sexual offences could be handled through self-completion on computer or in writing (PAPI or CAPI).

ICVS-2: Pilot studies⁵¹

Promoted by the International Governmental Research Directors, (IGRD), at the end of 2008 and the beginning of 2009, a pilot study using a short version of the ICVS questionnaire (called the ICVS-2 questionnaire) was conducted in Sweden, Germany, Canada, and United Kingdom. This pilot study was designed to learn what the contribution of CAWI and PAPI in terms of response might be and whether they have an exclusive range or overlap each other. The pilot measured the response rates obtained through variations in method, using both online and printed questionnaires. In addition, a similar survey was conducted through the means of CATI for comparison reasons. Face to face interviews were not included in the pilot due to their high costs relative to the other methodologies.

The main goal of the pilot was to have an in-depth analysis of the (none) response of the different methods and approaches used to conduct the survey. The secondary objective was to establish if the questionnaire ICVS-2 would be suitable for use with CAWI and PAPI.

The CATI sample was drawn by random digit dialling (RDD) of telephone numbers. Within a household, there was a random selection of a household member aged over 16 based on the first upcoming birthday. This process continued until the agreed amount of completed interviews (n=200) was reached.

In the CAWI and PAPI modes, the sample was drawn from an address register. To examine the overlap of the two methods, two random subgroups were created from the initial sample. Each group received an invitation letter containing a link to the website where respondents could fill in the survey. In this motivational letter respondents were asked to participate in the survey either online or by filling in a printed copy of the questionnaire. In the first group a printed copy of the questionnaire was included with the invitation letter. Respondents could fill it in and return it in a prepaid postage addressed envelope that was enclosed. In the second group respondents could request a printed questionnaire by sending back an enclosed answer card. They would then have a copy of the printed questionnaire sent to them which they could fill in and return with an enclosed addressed envelope. It was assumed that including the questionnaire with the invitation letter would lead to higher return rates of the printed copies, but that this would

⁵¹ Sources: van Dijk (T.) & Langerak (2009).

affect the number of people that completed the interview online in a negative way. In both groups respondents who had not replied received a reminder two weeks after they had received the initial invitation letter. To measure the effects of a reminder, both groups were again divided into two subgroups: one group in which respondents received only one reminder and one in which respondents received a second reminder sent one week after the first.

Using the same questionnaire, a second ICVS-2 pilot was conducted in 2010. This second pilot was funded by the European Commission and the fieldwork was conducted by Nicis. Six countries took part in it: Sweden, Germany, Canada, United Kingdom, Denmark and the Netherlands. The net samples included 4,000 respondents per country. Of these, 2,000 were interviewed using CATI, and 2,000 using CAWI. This second pilot is sometimes wrongly called the ICVS 2010.

ICBS / ICCS⁵²

The first International Commercial Crime Survey (ICCS) was carried out in eight European countries (Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) and Australia in 1994. It was based on a standardised questionnaire for businesses victimisation. Between 1995 and 1999, surveys with the same methodology were also replicated in St. Petersburg (Russia), Latvia and Lithuania to address the issue of the security of foreign businesses. The same questionnaire was used in 1995 in Andalusia, in 1997 in Estonia and 1998 in South Africa. A national survey using a very similar questionnaire was also conducted in Australia, followed by a national survey on the retail sector in 1999. Two surveys were carried out in south-western Finland in 1994–1995, mostly based on the same questionnaire.

The ICCS questionnaire mostly focused on experiences of victimisation, information on perceptions, and attitudes to several aspects of everyday business. Questions dealt with experiences of crime, safety in the area, pollution issues, security devices and costs involved, attitudes towards the police, and private policing. In the late 1990s, the ICCS questionnaire was modified to include more items on corruption. At the same time, the ICVS questionnaire was also revised to allow an expanded section on corruption. This revision was conducted by UNICRI, that developed a standard questionnaire based on the 1994 ICCS questionnaire, which was revised and finalised in co-operation with the National Institute of Justice, USA, and the Gallup Organisation, Hungary. Some sections were particularly analysed with a view to using them (a) for comparisons with other surveys on corruption, (b) as a complement to the ICVS, and (c) as a part of the assessment component of the Global Programme Against Corruption (GPAC) of the United Nations. The survey was renamed as International Crime Business Survey (ICBS) and was launched in 2000 –parallel to the ICVS– in the capitals of nine central eastern European countries under the supervision of UNICRI. The countries involved were Albania (Tirana), Belarus (Minsk), Bulgaria (Sofia), Croatia (Zagreb), Hungary (Budapest), Lithuania (Vilnius), Romania (Bucharest), Russia (Moscow) and Ukraine (Kiev). The questionnaire was translated into the languages of all participating countries.

The national co-ordinators appointed for the ICVS (leading criminologists or research institutions) in each participating country were also requested to monitor the progress of

52 Sources: Alvazzi del Frate (2004), van Kesteren (2003).

the ICBS. The role of the national coordinators included ensuring the correctness of the translation/localisation of the questionnaires, monitoring of the sampling procedure and participation in the training of the interviewers. Funding was provided by the Ministries of Justice and Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and the Ministry of Justice of Hungary. In order to provide for the highest comparability of the results, the fieldwork was contracted to a major international survey company, Gallup, which used its branches and associates in each participating country. Survey teams received standard training and guidelines for the project, along the lines of training provided for the ICVS. Because of the elevated costs involved, it was decided to limit the surveys to capital cities in each participating country. To ensure a representative sample of companies of different sizes and different business sectors, a total of 4,500 companies' managers were interviewed (500 in each city). The majority of countries used face to face interviews and obtained response rates of around 65%.

IVAWS⁵³

The International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) is an international and comparative survey on violence perpetrated by men against women. The IVAWS project was initiated in 1997 when HEUNI, together with a number of international experts in the field, started developing a comparative and standardised survey tool for measuring violence against women worldwide. The project was co-ordinated by HEUNI with inputs from UNODC, UNICRI, and Statistics Canada. The IVAWS combines the methodology and contacts developed for ICVS with the methodology developed for national violence against women surveys by Statistics Canada.

Pilot studies started in early November 2001, with Canada carrying out a 100 respondent survey. Other countries carried out pilot studies during 2002, including Argentina, Costa Rica, Denmark, Italy, Kazakhstan, Poland, Australia, Indonesia, Philippines, Serbia, Switzerland, and Ukraine. On the basis of these experiences, the final questionnaire was established in December 2002. It has already been translated into Chinese, Czech, Danish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish.

The questionnaire can be roughly divided into three parts: experienced violence, consequences of violence, and background information. The victimisation screeners are composed of twelve questions, each category beginning with a question on lifetime victimisation, and followed by a more detailed breakdown of prevalence and incidence by perpetrator. The most recent incidents of partner violence and non-partner violence are then explored in closer detail with separate sections dedicated for both types. Case details include things such as possible injuries, need of medical care, reporting (or not reporting) to the police, and the respondent's views on how her voice was heard. The survey methodology package includes, besides the questionnaire and a pre-programmed data capture programme, a Manual with detailed guidelines on how to implement the survey.

In Europe, the IVAWS was conducted in Denmark (2003), Greece (2003), Italy (2006), Poland (2004), and Switzerland (2004). In Denmark, Italy and Switzerland, interviews were conducted over the telephone; the remaining countries interviewed respondents face to face. Decisions about interviewing methods were based on practical

53 Sources: Johnson, Ollus & Nevala (2008), Nevala (2005).

considerations such as cost, telephone coverage and logistics, and were left to the discretion of coordinators in each country.

EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

In June 2006, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) started a project that led to the development of the European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS), conducted in 2010, which was preceded by a pilot survey conducted in 2008. Both surveys are described in the following chapters.

The pilot: FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants⁵⁴

In June 2006 the FRA launched a pilot victim survey in six EU Member States under the heading Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants' Experiences of Criminal Victimisation and Policing (also known as a FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants). The Member States involved were Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, Romania and Slovakia. The pilot was set out to test different sampling frames and the application of the survey questionnaire on selected immigrant and ethnic minority groups in each Member State. The primary objective of the pilot exercise was to establish whether a survey of this kind could be successfully extended to cover the EU27. The fieldwork for the survey research was undertaken towards the end of 2006 and the beginning of 2007, with the results of the exercise submitted for internal scrutiny by the Agency in May 2007.

For the purpose of the pilot research the following groups were selected for interviewing in the Member States (the sample size is indicated between brackets)

- Austria: Turkish, ex-Yugoslavians (N=700)
- Belgium: Turkish, North Africans, Italians (N=499)
- Bulgaria: Roma, Turkish (N=900)
- Italy: Albanian, North African, Romanian (N=603)
- Romania: Roma, Hungarian (N=600)
- Slovakia: Roma, Hungarian (N=605)

The pilot survey tested two main sampling frames in the six Member States: random digit dialling (RDD) with focused enumeration, and random route cluster sampling. The RDD technique with focused enumeration consist in selecting telephone numbers randomly, but retaining from the sample only those households where it can be verified that there is at least one resident from the selected ethnic groups. The random route cluster sampling consists in selecting an address inside a cluster (in this case a geographical area) and follow a random itinerary from this point (random route, also known as random walk). In every Member State all interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire.

The main questionnaire was developed by a group of experts involved in the development of the ICVS and the Eurobarometer questionnaire. The ICVS was extremely useful to the FRA as it provided a majority population control group with which to compare the results of the FRA survey on immigrants and ethnic minorities. It was also useful as it offered an established questionnaire that was adapted for the pilot questionnaire to incorporate new questions needed for a survey on minorities; for example questions on experiences of police stop and search, and whether there was any

⁵⁴ Source: Goodey (2008).

indication that experiences of victimisation were racially or ethnically motivated, such as the use of racist or religiously offensive language.

The survey: EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey⁵⁵

Following the success of the pilot survey exercise in six Member States, a full-scale survey was conducted in the 27 European Union Member States in 2008 under the name EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. The EU-MIDIS survey was conducted, from May to November 2008, asking samples of immigrant, ethnic minorities and national minorities groups in each Member State about their experiences of discrimination and victimisation.

The survey sampled persons (male and female) aged 16 and older who: (a) Self-identify themselves as belonging to one of the immigrant, ethnic minority or national minority groups selected for sampling in each Member State, (b) Are resident in the Member State being surveyed, (c) Have been resident in the Member State for at least one year, (d) Have sufficient command of (one of the) the national language(s) of the Member State being surveyed to lead a simple conversation with the interviewer. In each household that contained persons from the designated target groups, up to three eligible persons were invited to take part in the survey.

The target sample size per vulnerable group was 500, with 13 countries having 2 target groups, 11 countries having 1 group and 3 countries having 3 groups for surveying. In 10 countries an additional sample of a minimum of 500 majority persons (from the same areas where minority respondents lived) were also interviewed, to provide reference information for police stop-and-search practices. In total 5068 interviews were achieved with respondents from the majority population.

Sampling for the EU-MIDIS survey was based on a dual strategy: to cover major cities, including capitals, where immigrant groups for surveying are located, and to adopt an “on-location” approach for Member States where relevant minorities are primarily non-urban, or there are no real distinct urban centres (e.g. in the smallest Member States). EU-MIDIS adopted four distinct sampling approaches: (a) City/Metropolitan: random route sampling (RR) with focused enumeration (FE); (b) Registry-based address sample; (c) Nationwide random route with FE (d) Network sampling (NS). Only one primary sampling approach was used within a Member State.

The highest response rates were achieved in the following type (a)/(b)/(c) groups: Asians in Cyprus (89%); Romanians in Italy (69%); Brazilians in Portugal (67%); Roma in Slovakia (61%); North Africans in Italy (61%); Albanians in Italy (60%); Roma in the Czech Republic (58%). On the other hand, the lowest rates (below 20%) were recorded in the following type (a)/(b)/(c) groups: Somalis in Finland (17%); South American immigrants in Spain (17%); Bosnians in Slovenia (18%). The best response rates were recorded in type (c) samples (58%), when nationwide random route sampling was used in areas with a high density of mostly indigenous (predominantly Roma) minorities (in Bulgaria and in Poland fieldwork facilitators – e.g. community leaders, other trusted persons – were also used in order to gain access to potential participant groups). There was no significant difference on average in response rates between national registries based (type b) urban samples (31%) and focused enumeration-assisted random route

⁵⁵ Source: FRA (2009).

urban samples (38%). Samples obtained in interviewer-generated situations produced the second highest response rate overall – type (d): 54%.

SURVEYS ON VICTIMISATION IN THE 27 EU MEMBERS STATES

In this section we present surveys on victimisation conducted in each of the 27 European Union Member States.

AUSTRIA (ÖSTERREICH)⁵⁶

Austria participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2005 (EU ICS). Interviews were carried out using CATI methodology. The national representative samples were composed by 1,507 and 2,004 households and the response rates were 76% and 46% respectively.

The country also participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

The Austrian Safety Board conducts annually since 2006 the Security Barometer (*Sicherheitsbarometer*). The data collection takes place every spring and is conducted through telephone interviews by the OGM market research institute. This survey asks a representative sample of the population about (crime related) fears and especially about the fear of domestic burglary. Further questions deal with specific places in terms of crime (neighbourhood, urban area) and specific offences the respondents or someone amongst their acquaintanceship have experienced.

Austria also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 2,725 interviews have been conducted; 1,225 interviews using CAPI methodology and 1,500 using CATI methodology. The fieldwork was conducted by the Institute for Law and Criminal Sociology (*Institut für Rechts- und Kriminalsoziologie*) on behalf of Statistics Austria.

At the local scale, the Vienna Department of Urban Planning organised in 2003 the Survey Living in Vienna (*Leben in Wien 2003*) that included a set of questions related to crime and victimisation, and also on the respondents' evaluation of security in their surrounding, and in the city of Vienna in general. The sample included 8,300 individuals living in Vienna and aged over 14. The survey was conducted through a CATI random sampling procedure.

In 2002/03, Austria participated in the INSEC (Insecurities in European Cities)⁵⁷ study with a sample 1,079 interviews representative of two Viennese urban areas. The main focus of research was on the whole range of urban disorders and insecurities late modern urban societies, and on the effects of globalisation on urban residents' perception of insecurity, both on a local and regional level. The questionnaire included items on experiences of crime, risk assessment and victimisation.

In 2005, the survey Burglary Prevention in Private Households in Vienna was conducted with a representative sample of 1,000 Viennese households interviewed with CATI methodology. The survey included questions on victimisation experiences and fear of crime, considering namely domestic burglary. The survey was carried out by IFES.

⁵⁶ Main source: Stangl (2009).

⁵⁷ See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

On behalf of the Bureau of Women's Affairs of the city of Vienna, the IFES also conducted in 1998 a Survey on women's living conditions, opinions and satisfaction named Womens' Barometer (*Frauenbarometer*). The survey was based on a representative sample of the city of Vienna composed by 2,300 women. It included a set of questions that were similar or identical to those used in the Living in Vienna survey.

Austria participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 700 individuals with Turkish and ex-Yugoslavian origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 534 individuals with Turkish origins and 593 individuals with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The sample covered the city of Vienna, and the response rate was 85%.

BELGIUM (BELGIQUE/BELGIË)⁵⁸

Belgium participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 2,060, 1,485, 2,402 and 2,014 households with responses rates of 37%, 44%, 56% and 55% respectively, and applied CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Since 1997, Belgium conducts regularly a national victimisation survey called Security Monitor (*Moniteur de Sécurité*). This survey has been conducted in 1997, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006. According to Pauwels and Pleysier (2007) "the Security Monitor is the official national crime and victim survey, conducted [and financed] by the Federal Police, under the authority of the Ministry of the Interior. The Belgian Security Monitor, inspired by the Dutch Police Monitor, is in essence a federal, repeated cross-sectional, victim survey, using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). [...] In 1997, the Minister of the Interior ordered a first sweep of the Security Monitor at the federal level, and at the local level, in those communities that had a safety-contract (*veiligheids- en samenlevingscontract*) with the federal government or were 'pilot police zones'. The second sweep, conducted in 1998, introduced a postal survey as a possible, and cheaper, alternative to the telephone mode, in approximately 70 communities. After a thorough evaluation, it was decided not to offer the postal survey alternative in future sweeps. In order to create more time and budgetary space for further analyses and research, and the implementation of the Security Monitor in local communities, data collection is spread every two years since 1998. [...] The local Monitors are executed in all 73 communities with a safety-contract and in the police zones those communities belong to". The Security Monitor is based on a national, stratified random sample. The sample is selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification are geographical area and degree of urbanisation. In 2004, the survey used a sample of 41,017 (federal and local) households and obtained a response rate of 56% with CATI methodology. In 2006, it used a sample of 43,318 households (Police fédérale belge, 1997-2006).

58 Main source: Kellens, Peters & van Kerckvoorde (1993), Pauwels & Pleysier (2007, 2008).

Also according to Pauwels & Pleysier (2007), "Another important repeated cross-sectional survey is the APS-SCV survey (*Administratie Planning en Statistiek - Sociaal Culturele Veranderingen*) of the Flanders Authority. In contrast to the Security Monitor, the APS-SCV survey's main interest is not crime or victimisation; since 1996, it is an annual 'barometer' of socio-cultural changes among Dutch speaking inhabitants of the Flemish Community or the Brussels Capital Region. The main interest, therefore, is a broad one, dealing with values, attitudes and opinions of the Flemish on a number of relevant topics. There are some other important differences compared to the Security Monitor. The APS-SCV survey is not a federal survey, but concentrates on Flanders only. Furthermore, the data are gathered in face to face surveys (representative sample of 1,500 respondents) with a questionnaire in Dutch only. As the APS-SCV is an annual survey, some of the question blocks rotate; this is the case for the 'fear of crime' item set which was used in the questionnaire of the 1999, 2000, 2002 and 2004 sweep of the survey. Previously, we reported on secondary analyses investigating the temporal invariance assumption of the 'fear of crime' items of the 1999, 2000 and 2002 round".

Belgium participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 499 individuals with Turkish, North African and Italian origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 532 individuals with Turkish origins and 500 individuals with North African origins. The sample covered the cities of Brussels and Antwerp, and the response rate was 81%.

BULGARIA (БЪЛГАРИЯ [BĀLGARIJA])⁵⁹

Bulgaria used the ICVS questionnaire in Sofia in 1997 with the support of UNICRI. The ICVS was used with national representative samples in 2002 and 2004. Bulgaria participated in the EU ICS in 2004 with a sample of 1,101 households and obtained a response rate of 83%. The country used face to face interviews at the respondent home with a paper questionnaire. The ICVS questionnaire is currently being used for periodical national victimisation surveys conducted in 2005, 2007, 2008, and 2009. More details are provided in the Table 1.

⁵⁹ Main source: Bezlov, Gounev, Hristov, Stoyanov, Yordanova & Markov (2006), Stoyanov (2009).

Table 1: Victimisation surveys conducted in Bulgaria (Source: Stoyanov, 2009)

Year	Sample size	Institution	Questionnaire
2002	N=1615	CSD and Vitosha Research	ICVS
2004	N=1101	Idem	Idem (EU ICS)
2005	N=1202	Idem	Idem
2007	N=2463	Idem	Idem
2008	N=2499	Idem	Idem
2009	N=2500	Idem	Idem
Sample type random two stage cluster sample, representative of the general population aged 15 or more			
Method Face to face, in home interview, paper and pencil			

According to the Center for the Study of Democracy (2009): “Following the political and economic crisis in late 1996 and early 1997, a Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD) team, participating in UNDP’s Early Warning project, included in its monthly surveys a set of victimisation questions (UNDP, 1998)”.

Bulgaria participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

In 2004, the country conducted a Survey on non-registered criminality in the Republic of Bulgaria based on a victimisation survey with a sample of 2,619 households, representing 7,180 individuals. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The response rates were 87% for households and 97.5% for individuals. The survey was based on face to face interviews at the respondent home with a paper questionnaire. The survey used an ad hoc questionnaire. It was placed under the responsibility of the National Statistical Institute, Department of Demographic and Social Statistics.

Bulgaria participated in 2000 in the second round of the ICBS. The survey was conducted by Vitosha Research, under the supervision of UNICRI. . It used a random sample –drawn from the database of the National Statistical Institute– of 532 companies from the city of Sofia, stratified by size and sector. Interviews were conducted face to face. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands provided funding. A second business victimisation survey using the same questionnaire was also conducted by Vitosha Research in Sofia in 2004. In September 2005, a third survey was conducted using the same questionnaire but with a random national sample –representative of the companies in the country– of 308 companies, stratified by size and sector. The survey was financed by the Centre for the Study of Democracy. More information on these surveys is given in the Table 2.

Table 2: Business surveys conducted in Bulgaria

Year	Sample type	Sample size	Institution	Question naire	Method
2000	random sample of companies stratified by size and sector, representative of the companies in Sofia	N=532	CSD and Vitosha Research / Gallup	ICCS	Face to face, paper and pencil
2004	Idem	--	CSD and Vitosha Research	Idem	Idem
2005	random sample of companies stratified by size and sector, representative of the companies in the country	N=308	CSD and Vitosha Research	Idem	Idem

Source: Stoyanov, personal communication

Bulgaria participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 900 individuals with Roma and Turkish origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Turkish origins and 500 individuals with Roma origins. The response rate was 68%.

CYPRUS (ΚΥΠΡΟΣ/KIBRIS [ΚÝPROS])⁶⁰

Cyprus did not participate in the ICVS, but conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The pilot exercise was conducted by the Statistical Service of Cyprus (CRISTAT). It was decided to test the survey only in the two urban areas in which the highest incidence of crime is usually reported, according to the Police data, namely those of Lefkosia and Lemesos. Regarding sampling procedure, the 2001 Census of Population Register was used as the sampling frame and this was supplemented by the Register from the Electricity Authority of Cyprus (EAC). A two-stage sampling procedure was used. At the first stage, a sample of 1,000 households was selected from the above sampling frame, using simple random sampling. At the second stage, an individual in the age group 18-74 was randomly selected, using “the person who had the last birthday” method. The sample of 1,000 households was distributed in the two urban areas based on the latest distribution of households in them. The final selection included a gross sample size of 587 households for Lefkosia and 413 households for Lemesos. CAPI methodology was applied for Sections A-F of the questionnaire (with show cards for five questions in section D) and respondents were encouraged to complete by themselves the section on violence (section G) either on the computer or on paper (PAPI). However only 15.8% of the sample chose this option; the rest decided to continue the interview with the CAPI method used for sections A-F.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 505 individuals interviewed face to face.

Cyprus conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Asian origins. The response rate was 98%.

CZECH REPUBLIC (ČESKÁ REPUBLIKA)⁶¹

The Czech Republic participated as part of Czechoslovakia in the 1992 ICVS. The survey was conducted with a national representative sample of 1,821 households. The response rate was 91%. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, socio-professional qualifications, area of residence, regional distribution, and size of the population. Data were collected through face to face interviews conducted in June 1992 in the Czech and Slovak languages. The final sample for the Czech Republic consisted in 1,262 households. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

In 1996, the Czech Republic conducted the ICVS with a sample of multiple cities and a small rural sample. Interviews were conducted face to face. The sample was 1469 respondents aged 16 or older. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

Then, the ICVS was conducted in the city of Prague in 2000 with a city representative sample of 1,500 households (respondents aged 16 or older) and using CATI methodology. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The

60 Main source: Kapardis (2009).

61 Main source: Martinková (2009).

survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,022 individuals interviewed face to face.

The Czech Republic also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The Czech Statistical Office (CZSO) had the responsibility of conducting the pilot study, while the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention provides scientific expertise. The sample was based on voluntary participation and included 1,000 respondents (total sample was 690 interviews). The response rate was 69.1%. The country used 151 interviewers that were employees of the CZSO performing various fieldworks for the Office. Interviewers also filled an interviewer's questionnaire about their experience. The survey was conducted combining the following methods: (a) Face to face interview with paper and pencil questionnaire (method assessed by 52 interviewers); (b) Face to face interviews assisted with computer (method assessed by 48 interviewers); (c) Phone interview with paper and pencil (method assessed by 54 interviewers); and (d) Phone interview assisted with computer (method assessed by 58 interviewers). Interviewers considered that face to face interview with the respondents (based either on printed questionnaire or assisted with computer) were generally more comfortable than phone interviewing.

In 2004, the country conducted the study *Victimisation of Citizens of the Czech Republic by Some Types of Criminality in the Year 2004*. It was a multipurpose survey that did not use the ICVS questionnaire but included some comparable questions. It was conducted with a sample of 1,052 households selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, sex, education, size of the city, and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews at the respondent's home with a paper questionnaire. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

Between 2000 and 2003, four victimisation surveys were conducted with the financial support of the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic. The first three ones were part of the research project *Continual Research of Victimisation and Feeling of Security of Citizens (2000-2002)*. Researches of this project were conducted by the Department of Sociology of Charles University with representative samples at the national level in the years 2000 (1,386 respondents), 2001 (1,418 respondents), and 2002 (1,259 respondents). The fourth survey financed by the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic was the research project *Continual Research of Victimisation and Feeling of Security of Citizens*. This research followed up in some actual aspects the preceding research project. It was conducted by the Department of Sociology of Charles University. The representative sample at the national level was 1,418 individuals aged 16 or older. All these surveys did not use the ICVS questionnaire, but an ad hoc one.

In 2006, the country conducted the survey *Experiences of Czech Republic Citizens with Some Offences*. The survey was based on an adapted version of the ICVS questionnaire. According to Martinková (2008): "The survey was conducted with a group of 3,082 respondents over the age of 15 throughout the Czech Republic. The group of

respondents was obtained by a stratified, multi-layered selection and was representative in the indicators: age, sex, size of the place of residence, education, higher territorial administrative unit (region). The field research was performed by the firm GfK and the data collection was financed by the National Committee for Crime Prevention. Polling was conducted face to face.” The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. Interviews were conducted face to face. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

The Czech Republic conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 505 individuals of Roma origins. The response rate was 94%.

DENMARK (DANMARK)

Denmark participated in the ICVS in 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). Interviews were carried out using CATI methodology. The national representative samples were composed by 3,007 and 1,984 households and the response rates were 66% and 44% respectively.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Denmark also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009 with a random sample of 1,073 individuals aged 16 to 75. The sample frame was the Population Register, which covers all registered residents in Denmark. 447 interviews were conducted using CATI methodology and 202 using CAWI and CASI methodology. The overall response rate was 64%. The pilot was conducted by Statistics Denmark's Survey Division, Interview services.

In 2010, Denmark took part in the second ICVS-2 pilot study funded by the European Commission and conducted by Nicis, with a sample of 4,000 respondents (2,000 achieved using CATI, and 2,000 using CAWI)

From a historical point of view, it has been pointed out that the first victimisation survey took place in the city of Aarhus, Denmark, in 1730 (Wolf & Hauge, 1975). The city council reacted to the complaints of the citizens by asking six persons to go through all the households of the town asking their inhabitants if they had been victims of burglary during the last 3 or 4 year. At that time, Aarhus had a population of approximately 3,500 persons and according to them there had been 188 burglaries, which implies that around 1% to 2% of the households had been victims of such a crime (Balvig, 1987; Garrido, Stangeland & Redondo, 2001: 696-7).

In the contemporary period, the Nordic countries were also pioneers in conducting victimisation surveys. As Sparks (1981) has mentioned, at the beginning of the 1970s the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology financed a series of victimisation survey on violent crime and on property crimes in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden (Aromaa 1971, 1974a, 1974b; Wolf & Hauge 1975; Aromaa & Leppa 1973).

Apart from that, since 2005, Denmark also has an annual victimisation survey. The project started with two national victimisation surveys in 1995 and 1996 placed under the responsibility of the National Police with the University of Copenhagen providing expertise, and Statistics Denmark conducting the interviews by using CATI methodology. The questionnaire was not based on the ICVS questionnaire, but included some comparable questions. In 2005, this victimisation survey was carried out again using the same questionnaire and the same methodology. Since then, it has been conducted every year and will continue to be conducted annually. The sample size is approximately 12,000 individuals for each survey and the response rate is around 65%. National registers are used to select a random and national representative sample. Since 2005, the survey is financed by the National Police, the Crime Preventive Council and the Ministry of Justice. The University of Copenhagen and The Ministry of Justice provides expertise in conducting the analyses and writing the report.

Denmark also participated in the IVAWS in 2003. The Survey was placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice and the report made in cooperation with The University of Copenhagen. 3,552 females were interviewed and the response rate was 55%. The survey was conducted using CATI methodology.

In the fall of 2007, a national survey on dating violence took place in Denmark. It was an internet-based survey (CAWI) based on a random sample of 2,123 Danish residents aged 16-24 (drawn from the Danish register of all registered residents in Denmark). The survey also included qualitative information based on focus group discussions. The response rate was 28%. The Survey was conducted by the National Institute of Public Health, the University of Southern Denmark, and the Ministry of Gender Equality (Schütt et al., 2008)

Denmark conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 553 individuals with Turkish origins and 561 individuals with Somali origins. The sample covered the cities of Copenhagen and Odense, and the response rate was 98%.

ESTONIA (EESTI)⁶²

Estonia participated in four sweeps of the ICVS, in 1993, 1995, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS). Indeed, the ICVS has become a sort of regular national victimisation survey and, in that context, it was conducted again in 2009.

In 1993, for the first ICVS conducted in Estonia, the country used a national representative sample of 1,000 households. In 1995, the national representative sample included 1,173 households and the questionnaire was available in two languages (Estonian and Russian). In 2000, the country used a national representative sample that included an urban subsample (N=502) of the city of Tallinn. In 2004, the EU ICS used a sample of 1,678 households (including a subsample of 482 households in Tallinn) and obtained a response rate of 52%. In 2009, the fieldwork was carried out by the national Statistical Office (previously it was done by private companies). The 2009 survey was based on the ICVS questionnaire but included a few modifications. As a consequence, the comparability of the answers' structure with other ICVS surveys should be rather good but, due to a longer fieldwork period (several months instead of 2-3 weeks) and

62 Main source: Ahven (2008, 2009).

some differences in sampling, the results (including victimisation rates) may not always be fully comparable. The final sample included approximately 4,500 households (the original sample before fieldwork included at least 6,500 households). Samples were drawn from official national registration lists using a multistage probability sampling. They were stratified by geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The methodology is based on face to face interviews in the respondent's home. Since 2000, interviewers use CAPI to register the answers.

The 1993–2004 surveys were placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of the Interior, Internal Security Policy Department. In 2004, it was co-financed by The Ministry of Justice, and the Tartu University provided institutional support by compiling a report on the results. The 2009 survey was carried out by the Statistical Office in cooperation with the Ministry of Justice, Criminal Policy Department.

Estonia also participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Apart from that, Estonia conducted in 1998 a crime against businesses survey using the same questionnaire as the one used for the first ICBS/ICCS in 1994. In 2007, the Criminal Policy Department of the Ministry of Justice conducted a study on offences committed against enterprises and employees in 2006, which aim was to analyse (1) the forms and extent of crime directed against enterprises (estimations of enterprise managers of the problem); (2) the nature of the offences directed against the employees of undertakings and agencies (personal experience of the employees with offences committed with respect to them, including by the employer, at the workplace). The study contained two different interviews with a different questionnaire for each target group: (1) a telephone interview with the managers of 702 enterprises; (2) a laptop assisted interview at the homes of 526 employees. Information on enterprises was obtained by random choice from the commercial register, taking account of their classification by size (on the basis of the number of employees). The employees to be interviewed were found by a random choice from the database of the Statistical Office. The sample covered the residents of 15–74 of age who were employed most of the time in 2006. The response rate for enterprises was 32.4% (702 interviews out of a sample of 2168) and for employees it was 29.9% (742 interviews –of which 526 for this survey– out of a sample of 2482).

Estonia conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Russian origins. The sample covered the city of Tallinn, and the response rate was 89%.

FINLAND (SUOMI/FINLAND)⁶³

Finland participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 1,025, 1,620, 3,899, 1,783, and 2,500 households with response rates of 70%, 86%, 86%, 77%, and 57%. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women

63 Main source: Aromaa (2009), Aromaa & Heiskanen (1992), Heiskanen (2009).

51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Finland conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. Three institutions were involved in the piloting: HEUNI, Statistics Finland, the Department of Statistics and Applied Mathematics at the University of Helsinki. The Finnish pilot study included three sub-surveys. Each of these tested a different data collection mode: face to face interviews, CATI and CAWI. The original questionnaire was designed for a face to face interview in which separate show cards were to be used to improve the quality of the data; but the more detailed questions concerning different types of crime were dropped out from the telephone and web surveys. The gross sample size was 750 in the face to face and CATI versions, and 2,000 in the CAWI version. The sampling strategy was the same in all three cases. The target population consisted of permanent residents in Finland living in private households and aged 15 or older. The frame population was divided into strata based on a cross-classification of regions, gender and age bracket, and a stratified random sampling strategy was used.

Historically, the first Finnish victimisation surveys took place in the early 1970s, when the Scandinavian Criminological Research Council funded a series of surveys on victimisation for violent crime and property crime in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden (see Denmark chapter, with references).

Currently, Finland carries out a periodical victimisation survey called the Finnish National Safety Survey. Victimisations include crimes but also injuries (traffic, work, home, leisure, and sport). The survey has been conducted in 1980, 1988, 1993, 1997, 2003, 2006, and 2009. In 2006, the sample was national and consisted in 8,163 individuals with a response rate of 81%. The sample is selected through simple probability sampling and is representative at the national level. In 2006, the survey was conducted using CATI methodology, together with CAPI for persons without telephone. In 1980, 1988 and 1997, the survey was financed by Statistics Finland. In 2006, the Finnish National Safety Survey was conducted under the responsibility of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy (OPTULA). It was financed by the Ministry of justice, the Ministry of interior, and the Ministry of social affairs and wealth. The Police college of Finland provided institutional support and expertise (Heiskanen, 2006).

Finland participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a regional sample (District of Oulu) and using the CATI method. Moreover, two crime against businesses surveys were carried out in South-Western Finland in 1994-95, using basically the same questionnaire as the one used for the first ICCS in 1994. In 1996 and 1997, the Finnish police organised another crime against businesses survey.

Finland has also carried out two times a survey on violence against women called "Faith, hope, battering". The survey took place in 1997 and 2005. It used a mail questionnaire. In 1997, the sample consisted in 4,955 females and the response rate was 70%. In 2005, the sample consisted in 4,464 females (aged 18-74) and the response rate was 62%. Samples were selected through simple probability sampling and were representative at the national level. The surveys were placed under the responsibility of Statistics Finland, the Ministry of Social Welfare and Health, the Ministry of Justice the National Research

Institute of Legal Policy, the Police college of Finland and HEUNI (Heiskanen & Piispa, 1998, 2008).

Finland conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 562 individuals with Russian origins and 484 individuals with Somali origins in the city of Helsinki (metro area). The response rate was 69%.

FRANCE (FRANCE)⁶⁴

France participated in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000, and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 1,502, 1,003, 1,000, and 2,016 households with responses rates of 51%, 61%, 45%, and 47% respectively, using CATI methodology. In 2005, the sample included a subsample of 800 households in Paris.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

In 1986, the CESDIP (*Centre de recherches sociologiques pour le droit et les institutions pénales*/Center for Sociological Research in Law and Penal Institutions) conducted the first nationwide victimisation survey, covering the years 1984-5. According to Philippe Robert (2007): "A series of screening questions were initially incorporated into an omnibus survey (11,156 interviewees were chosen from quota samples of the target population). Among the victims thus identified, sub-populations were formed – with specific sampling for each type of victimisation, based on frequency – and 1,138 interviews were conducted. The questionnaire borrowed from similar surveys done in other countries, but also made full use of the results of the qualitative research...". The survey was based on face to face interviews and used individuals –aged 16 or older– instead of households as counting units. Thus, victimisation rates were calculated for individuals even when the offence concerned a household, (e.g. robbery). The questionnaire was modeled on those used in similar surveys in other countries, but also took into consideration the results of qualitative research.

Between 1996 and 2006, the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Surveys (INSEE) conducted eleven annual surveys on the Living conditions of households that contained a module on victimisation. Interviews were conducted face to face using households as counting units. The questions on victimisation were loosely based on the ones included in the ICVS; however, according to Didier et al. (2009), in the 11 surveys only 6 times the questions were identical to the ones used the year before (1998 and 2000-04). The basic sample was composed by approximately 6'000 households and the samples were *semi-rotating* until 2004. This means that half of the sample interviewed one year was interviewed again the year after. In particular, in 2004, the sample included 6,351 households; in 2005, it included 13,872; and in 2006 it included roughly 13,263. The increase in 2005 is due to the fact that the basic sample of 6,400 households, that included 400 households from disadvantaged urban areas (DUA), was doubled by another one, roughly the same size (7,650 precisely), which included 1,240 households from DUA. With the exception of 2005, the samples were representative at the national level and selected using probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. In 2006, the response rate was 26% and the face to face

64 Main source: Robert (2008), Robert, Zauberman, Névanen and Didier (2008), Zauberman (2009).

interviews were conducted using the CAPI methodology. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the INSEE. The survey on the living conditions of households disappeared in 2006.

However since 2005, another annual survey started taking place. It is called “Framework of life and security” (*Cadre de vie et sécurité*). The new questionnaire is inspired by the one used in the British Crime Survey (Didier et al. 2009) and, thus, the questions are not strictly comparable to the former ones. The survey is directed by the INSEE and the OND (National Observatory of Delinquency, which is part of the INHES, National Institute of Higher Studies for Domestic Security). It is financed by the INHES, the Interministerial Agency for Urban Affairs and Social Development (DIV) and the OFDT (French Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction). In 2005, a national representative sample of 6,512 households was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The response rate was 30% and surveys were conducted face to face using the CAPI methodology.

Regarding local victimisation surveys, France conducted in 1989 two surveys (financed by the above mentioned DIV) using CATI methodology. One was conducted in Épinay with 1,780 interviews and the other in the Toulouse urban area with 1,576 interviews. In 1999, a pilot survey in Amiens was carried out by the CESDIP with a sample of 1,156 interviews and CATI methodology. The Amiens survey served as the basis for a survey of the Île-de-France region organised by the CESDIP for the Île-de-France Regional Institute for Urban Planning (IAURIF) in 2001. The Île-de-France survey was based on a sample of 10,504 interviewees, and it was replicated in 2003, 2005, 2007 and 2009. The Amiens study also served as the basis for CESDIP telephone surveys conducted in 2005 in five cities that are members of the French Forum for Urban Safety, using samples between 1,000 and 5,000 individuals depending on the area⁶⁵.

France also participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was taken from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted through CATI. Response rates were 49% for companies with 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

France also conducted the National French Survey on Violence Against Women in 2000. The sample size was 6,970 females. The national representative sample was selected through multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The response rate was 71.3% with CATI methodology. The survey was also placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Demography of Paris 1 University. It was financed by the State Secretariat of Women Rights and Professional Education, Service of Women Rights and Equality.

The country also participated in the European Social Surveys of 2002, 2004 and 2006, with funding for the French participation provided by the Ministry of Research, and scientific expertise provided by the Centre for the studies of French political life (CEVIPOF).

65 For details, see Robert (2007).

France also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 534 individuals with North African origins and 466 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the cities of Paris (metro area), Marseille and Lyon, and the response rate was 69%.

GERMANY (DEUTSCHLAND)

Germany participated twice in the ICVS, in 1989 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 5,274 and 2,025 households with responses rates of 30% and 43% respectively, and used CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) with samples of 2,000 interviews conducted face to face, of which 1,000 in the former Eastern State and 1,000 in the former Western State. Germany also participated in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of 2,035 and 1,573 individuals respectively, interviewed face to face.

Germany conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009 using mainly a postal survey. A total of 1,306 interviews were carried out with PAPSI for the victimisation screeners, followed by CATI, CAPI or PAPSI for the victim forms. The response rate was 49%. The exercise was conducted by the Federal Statistical Office.

The country participated in 2009 in the first pilot of the ICVS-2, conducted by Nicis. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The sample included 319 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (82 households for CAWI and 237 households for PAPI) and 223 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI, the overall response rate was 10.6%. In particular, the response rates were 2.7% for the CAWI methodology (2.1% when the questionnaire was included and 2.9% when an answer card was included), 7.9% for the PAPI methodology (15.1% when the questionnaire was included and 0.2% when an answer card was included), and 11.7% for CATI methodology. In 2010, Germany also participated in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 households.

According to Obergfell-Fuchs (2008): "The first (published) victim survey in Germany dates 1973, from then until 1990 the frequency of such surveys was quite low with a mean of about 2 surveys within 5 years. But in the early 1990s a steep increase occurred, up to about 5 surveys per year were conducted and since then, the quantity remained on this higher plateau, which is about the quadruple of the numbers of the 1980s." Obergfell-Fuchs (2008) identifies 34 surveys on victimisation and insecurity that are included in Table 3 at the end of this chapter. Most of them "were designed by research institutes to answer special scientific questions, some others, especially those in later years, have been developed in cooperation between local governments and research institutes, their major goal was local policy planning. Until now periodic national or state-wide victimisation surveys are still lacking in Germany. On a local level, some efforts were made to develop such periodic surveys, but either they cover only a more or less narrow period of time or the intervals between the particular inquiries is quite long hence, longitudinal interpretations might be rather flawed."

At the national level, Germany conducted a victimisation survey in 1997-1998, which was part of two multi-thematic surveys. An ad-hoc questionnaire survey was used with a national representative sample of 20,070 and 3,272 households with a response rate of 67%. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area. The sample was representative at first regional level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Constance, School of Law, and it was financed by the Federal Ministry of Justice.

Another multipurpose survey, called Experiences of Victimisation and Attitudes to Inner Security in Germany, was conducted in 2003 using parts of the ICVS questionnaire and face to face interviews at the respondent's home using a paper questionnaire. The sample included 400 households and the response rate 70%. The sampling procedure was simple probability sampling. The sample was representative at the second regional level. This survey was placed under the responsibility of the Max-Planck-Institute and the *XXXBundeskriminalamt*. The Department of Criminology of the University of Freiburg provided expertise.

A multipurpose survey called Insecurities in Europe Cities – Crime related fear within the context of new anxieties and community based crime prevention (INSEC)⁶⁶ was conducted in 2002 in Hamburg. The survey used an ad-hoc questionnaire with a sample of 861 households and obtained a response rate of 24%. The survey used face to face interviews at the respondent's home using a paper questionnaire. The sample was representative of two districts or neighbourhoods in the city of Hamburg, and the sample was drawn by simple probability sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Hamburg, Department of Criminology.

In the city of Bochum, the survey Victims of Crime in Bochum: A Long Term Comparative Study of a Large German City was conducted in 1975, 1986, and 1998. The survey used face to face interviews and, later, CATI methodology. In 1998, the sample size was 1,661 households and the response rate 80%. The sample was drawn by simple probability sampling and was representative of the city of Bochum. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the University of Bochum, Faculty of Law. It was financed by the Volkswagen Foundation (*VW-Stiftung*), and an International Advisory Board provided expertise.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted through CATI. The response rates were 49% for companies of 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

66 The INSEC was a comparative study funded by the European Commission within its 5th Framework Programme (1998-2002) - Key Action: Improving the Socio-Economic Knowledge Base) -, conducted in five European cities (Amsterdam, Budapest, Hamburg, Krakow and Vienna) in 2002-3. The study was designed by a group of international academics. The aim was to study urban disorder and insecurity, as well as the effects of globalization on the perception of the latter, both at the local and regional level. Interviews were conducted face to face using a paper version of the questionnaire. The questionnaire included questions on experiences of victimisation and victimisation risk assessments. It was developed in German and translated into Hungarian, Polish, Flemish and Turkish. The latter version was used to interview Turkish immigrants in Hamburg.

Germany conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 503 individuals with Turkish origins and 500 individuals with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The sample covered the cities of Berlin, Frankfurt and Munich. The response rate was 80%.

Table 3: Victimization and Insecurity Surveys in Germany according to the review of Obergfell-Fuchs (2008)

No	Author	Year	Territorial Scope	Focus	Publication
1	Stephan	1973	local: Stuttgart	general	Stephan (1976)
2	Schwind	1973/74	local: Göttingen	general	Schwind et al. (1975)
3	Schwind et al.	1975 – 1986 – 1998	local: Bochum	general	Schwind et al. (2001)
4	Kreuzer et al.	1990	no area specified	university students	Kreuzer et al. (1993)
5	Arnold et al.	1981	regional/ supranational: Baden-Württemberg, Germany – Baranya, Hungary – Texas, USA	general	Teske & Arnold (1991); Arnold & Korinek (1991)
6	Plate et al.	1982	local: Solingen	general	Plate et al. (1985)
7	Sessar, Boers	1984	local: Hamburg	general	Boers (1991); Sessar (1992)
8	Kury	1989	national: 1st ICVS	general	Kury (1991)
9	Aben	1990	local: Lübeck	general	Aben (1992)
10	Kury et al 1990	1991	national: East and West Germany	general	Kury et al. (1992)
11	Boers et al.	1991 – 1993 – 1995	national: East and West Germany	general	Boers et al. (1997)

No	Author	Year	Territorial Scope	Focus	Publication
12	Kury et al.	1991/92 – 1995-96	local/regional: Freiburg – Emmendingen – Löffingen	general	Kury et al. (2000)
13	Kräupl, Ludwig	1991/92 – 1995/96 – 2001/02	local/regional: Jena – Kahla- Suhl	general	Kräupl & Ludwig (1993, 2000); Ludwig & Kräupl (2005)
14	Wetzels et al.	1992	national: East and West Germany	general	Wetzels et al. (1995)
15	Schwind et al.	1993	local: Bochum	students 6–21y	Schwind et al. (1995)
16	Funk et al.	1994	local: Nuremberg	students 12–15y	Funk (1995)
17	Research Group Community Crime Prevention in Baden-Wuerttemberg	1994	local/regional: Calw, Freiburg, Ravensburg, Weingarten	general	Dölling et al. (2003)
18	Research Group Community Crime Prevention Baden-Wuerttemberg	1995	national	general	Forschungsgruppe Kommunale Kriminalprävention Baden-Württemberg (1998)
19	Heinz et al.	1997	national	general	Schnell & Kreuter (2000)
20	Hermann et al.	1997 – 2004	local: Schwetzingen	general	Hermann & Laue (2005)
21	Kury et al.	1998	local: Reutlingen	general	Kury et al. (1999a)
22	Kury et al.	1998	local: Metzingen	general	Kury et al. (1999b)

No	Author	Year	Territorial Scope	Focus	Publication
23	Wetzels et al.	1998	local: Munich, Kiel, Hamburg, Hanover, Wunstorf, Lilienthal, Leipzig, Stuttgart, Schwaebisch-Gmuend	students 15–17y	Wetzels et al. (2001)
24	Hermann, Döl-ling	1998	local: Freiburg, Heidelberg	general 14–70y	Hermann & Dölling (2001)
25	Oberwittler et al.	1999	local: Freiburg, Cologne	students 13–17y	Oberwittler et al. (2001)
26	Kury et al.	2000	local: Mannheim	general	Posch et al. (2001)
27	Oberwittler et al.	2000	regional: Markgraefler Land	students 13–18y	Oberwittler et al. (2002)
28	Wilmers et al.	2000	local/regional: Ham-burg, Hanover, Leipzig, Munich, Friesland	students 15–17y	Wilmers et al. (2002)
29	Sessar et al.	2001	local/supranational: Hamburg, Amsterdam, Budapest, Cracow, Vienna	general	Sessar (2006)
30	Dreher et al.	2003	local: Rottweil	general	Dreher et al. (2005)
31	Müller, Schröttle	2003	national	women	Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (2004)
32	Feltes, Goldberg	2003/04	local: Bochum	students 11–17y	Feltes & Goldberg (2006)
33	Gallup/Europe, Kury et al.	2005	national: ICVS	general	EUICS Report (2005)
34	Pfeiffer et al.	2005	local/regional: Munich, Stuttgart, Schwaebisch-Gmuend, Kassel, Dortmund, Oldenburg, Lehrte, Belm, Wallenhorst, Peine, Soltau-Fallingbostel, Thuringia	students 10–11 y 15–17 y	Baier et al. (2006)

Source: Obergfell-Fuchs (2008).

GREECE (ΕΛΛΑΔΑ [ELLÁDA])⁶⁷

In 1991, a pilot study of the ICVS was conducted in the city of Athens with the financial support of the University of Athens and Panteion University. The sample was composed of 345 households selected randomly from the archives of a public utility company. Interviews were conducted face to face by a team composed of university postgraduate students. The response rate was 77%. Only a summary of the first results of this research has been published (Spinellis et al. 1991).

Greece participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,020 households and a 44% response rate using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

At the national level, only one victimisation survey was conducted, in 2001. The results are available only in Greek (Karydis, 2004). In the city of Athens, surveys on fear of crime were conducted in 1998 and 2004 by the Panteion University.

Greece participated in the IVAWS survey in 2003. However, the results were not included in the international publication of the findings because the survey was still going on at the moment of the publication.

Greece also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 503 individuals with Albanian origins and 505 individuals with Roma origins. The sample covered the cities of Athens and Thessaloniki, and the response rate was 65%.

HUNGARY (MAGYARORSZÁG)⁶⁸

Hungary participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2005 (EU ICS) with samples of 756 and 2,103 households and obtained response rates of 80.7% and 53% respectively. Face to face methodology was used in 1996 and CATI in 2005.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,040 individuals interviewed face to face.

Hungary also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The target population was individuals aged 18 and over, living in private households in Budapest and five other counties. The gross sample size was 1,096 individuals and the response rate was 59% using face to face interviews with paper and pencil questionnaires. The response rate was lower in Budapest (39, 2%) than in the other counties. The survey was carried out by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office, using its own most experienced interviewers. The implementation of the survey was coordinated by the Social Services Statistics Department, the operational work was organised by the Regional Directorate Debrecen at the local level in the selected counties and in Budapest.

67 Main source: Zarafonitou (2009).

68 Main source: Kerezsi (2009).

Hungary conducted in 2003 a national survey called Victims and Opinions with a sample of 10,020 households and obtained a response rate of 42.3%. The survey used a probability sample drawn from the register of registered residents in Hungary. The sample was stratified according to the size of the county of residence, age, and gender. It was representative at the national level. The questionnaire was not based on the ICVS questionnaire, but included some comparable questions. The methodology is based on face to face interviews in the respondent's home. The survey was placed under the responsibility of National Institute of Criminology.

In 2002/03, Hungary participated in the INSEC⁶⁹ study with a sample 1,001 interviews, representative of two urban areas of Budapest. The survey was conducted by the National Institute of Criminology.

Hungary participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a city sample from Budapest. Interviews were conducted face to face. The country also participated in the ICBS in 2000, conducted by GALLUP. Funding was provided by UNICRI and the Ministry of Justice of Hungary. The survey was carried out through CATI in the city of Budapest, with a sample size of 517 companies. The sample was drawn from the database of the National Statistical Institute.

This country also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Roma origins. The sample covered the cities of Budapest and Miskolc, and the response rate was 81%.

IRELAND (EIRE/IRELAND)

Ireland participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 2,003 households and a 42% response rate using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

The Irish National Crime Council (2009) points out that a survey called Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland, which drew on Garda records from November 1994 to October 1995, was conducted in 1996 (Watson, 2000). This survey was commissioned by the Garda Research Unit to the Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI). Before this, the last large scale survey of Crime and Victimization patterns in Ireland had been carried out in the early 1980s.

Currently, the Central Statistics Office (CSO) examines Crime and Victimization rates in Ireland as part of their Quarterly National Household Surveys (QNHS). These have been conducted in 1998, 2003, 2006 and 2009 (Irish National Crime Council, 2009). Thus, the Quarterly National Household Survey can be considered as a sort of regular national victimisation survey.

⁶⁹ See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

In 2003, the QNHS used a sample of 29,436 households selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. Age and gender are also used in the weighting process. The sample was representative at the second regional level. The response rate was 85%, using CAPI methodology. In 2006, 39,000 households were surveyed. This sample was mathematically adjusted to be representative of the population of the Republic of Ireland as a whole (Irish National Crime Council, 2009)

According to the Irish National Crime Council (2009): "In addition to the QNHS, the annual Garda Public Attitudes Survey provides an alternative source of information regarding the 'dark figure' of unreported crime in Ireland." This survey estimates the percentage of offences recorded to the police and has been conducted annually since 2002.

Ireland also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 609 individuals with Central and Eastern European origins and 503 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the Dublin metro area, and the response rate was 41%.

ITALY (ITALIA)⁷⁰

Italy participated two times in the ICVS, in 1992 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative samples of 2,044 and 2,023 households with response rates of 61% and 54% respectively, and using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Italy also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 503 interviews were carried out with CATI methodology. The response rate was 48%. A random sampling procedure, stratified by region and place size, was used. The survey was conducted by the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT).

In 1991, UNICRI carried out an investigation about victimisation with the support of the Ministry of the Interior. It involved a sample of 2,024 people (aged 16 or over) and it has been used mainly for international comparative purposes. In 1994, the Cattaneo Institut conducted together with DOXA a national victimisation survey with a sample of 6,291 individuals older than 15 years (Barbagli, 1995).

Italy conducts the multipurpose survey called The Italian Citizens' Safety Survey (*Sicurezza dei cittadini*) every five years since 1997/98. The second survey was conducted in 2002 and the third one in 2008-2009. In 2002 a national representative sample of 60,000 households was used (with substitution), and the response rate was 64.3% (not considering the out of target phone numbers). The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the first regional level. The mode of data collection was telephone interviewing (CATI). The

70 Main source: Muratore (2009), Sacchini & Selmini (2007, 2008), Sacchini (2008).

survey was placed under the responsibility of the Central Direction for life conditions and quality of life surveys (DCCV) of ISTAT (Muratore & Tagliacozzo, 2008).

Italy also conducts the national multipurpose survey called Everyday Life Aspects (*Aspetti della vita quotidiana*). This survey is carried out yearly since 1993. Data on bag-snatching and pick-pocketing were collected from 1993 to 2003. Data on social decay were collected from 1999 to 2003. A question on the perception of risk of criminality in the own area is still collected. The sample across the years is 24,000 households (about 60,000 individuals) and the response rates were around 90% in 1993 and 86% in 2003. Surveys used self-administered questionnaires (for instance for social decay and soft-crimes indicators). The method of data collection is PAPI. The sampling procedure is multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification are geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample is representative at the regional level and all regions are covered. All members of the selected households are interviewed. The survey is placed under the responsibility of the DCCV of ISTAT.

On a regional level, in 1997, the Italian Citizens' Safety Survey was extended also to the Emilia-Romagna area through an oversampling of 9,000 individuals (added to the already available 2,000 interviews in the Region; thus the total sample is 11,000 interviewed in an area with 4 millions inhabitants) and according to an agreement between the regional government and the ISTAT. In 2002, Emilia Romagna and four other regions (Tuscany, Abruzzo, Campania, Lazio) were oversampled. The total oversampling for the five regions was 30,000 interviews. In the city of Bologna, the oversampling was of 1,000 interviews that, added to those already available by the national research with reference to the city, bring the total number of the individuals interviewed to 1,707. In 2008, an oversampling was carried out in 5 provinces (Bari, Napoli, Reggio Calabria, Palermo, Catania) of the South, requested by the Italian Home Office (*Ministero dell'Interno*).

On a local level, in 1994, the Cattaneo Institute developed a local victimisation survey in the city of Bologna. In this case, the sample was composed by 1,614 individuals. The minimum age was 18, and the interviews were conducted face to face.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS. A national representative sample was used. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). The interviews were conducted through CATI. Response rates vary between 49% for companies with 1-10 employees and 66% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

The country also conducted in 2006 a survey on violence against women called the Women Safety Survey (*Sicurezza delle donne*), which has a particular focus on domestic violence. The sample consisted in 25,000 females aged between 16 and 70. The response rate was 67.7% (not considering the out of target phone numbers). The questionnaire was somehow inspired by the IVAWS questionnaire (some questions are comparable) but it also included some different and new questions. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. The sample was

representative at the first regional level. The survey was conducted using CATI methodology. It was financed by the Equal Opportunity Department (DPO), and carried out by the DCCV of ISTAT (Muratore, 2004; Muratore & Corazziari, 2008).

Italy participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 603 individuals with Albanian, North African and Romanian origins. In 2008, this country also participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Albanian origins and 501 individuals with North African origins and 502 individuals with Romanian origins. The sample covered the cities of Rome, Milan and Bari, and the response rate was 88%. The interviews were conducted face to face.

In 2010, ISTAT conducted a survey on foreign people and their integration and quality of life in Italy. The survey included a module on victimisation suffered in the last 3 years and last 12 months. The survey used a sample of 12,000 foreign residents living in private households.

LATVIA (LATVIJA)

Latvia conducted the ICVS in 1995, 1998 and 2000. In 1995 and 1998 it used multiple cities samples combined with a small rural sample (in 1998 the sample was composed of 1,411 households), and in 2000 it used a national representative sample.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,008 individuals interviewed face to face.

Latvia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The exercise was conducted by the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia (CSB). The questionnaire was tested using both CAPI and CATI with samples of 150 CAPI interviews and 100 CATI interviews. For creating a sample, data from the Latvian Population Register were used. The age group from 18 to 74 years was chosen. Then, one person from the household was selected. The Mathematical Support division of the CSB created the sample. The questionnaire was tested in 5 cities/towns, 5 rural municipalities, and one rural territory. Moreover, in Riga, the suburbs of Latgale, which present the highest crime rate, were selected for the sample.

Latvia also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Russian origins. The sample covered the cities of Riga and Daugavpils, and the response rate was 86%.

LITHUANIA (LIETUVA)

Lithuania participated three times in the ICVS, in 1996/97, 2000, and 2005. In 1996/97, it used multiple cities samples combined with a small rural sample. The sample size was 1,176 households with a response rate of 53.7%. In 2000, a sample of 1526 household from Vilnius was used. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and was representative at the city level. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews. It was placed under the responsibility of the Law Institute, Criminological Research Department, and it was financed by UNICRI.

Even if Lithuania participated in the ICVS in 2005, data arrived after the final deadline and therefore the country is not included in the main publications about the survey.

The country also participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,016 individuals interviewed face to face.

Lithuania also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The target population was composed by individuals aged 15 and over and living in private households within the territory of the Republic of Lithuania. The Population Register was used as a sampling frame. The sample size of the field-testing covered 300 persons (150 from Šiauliai county and 150 from Panevėžys county). A stratified sample design was used. There were 12 strata: 2 largest cities, other cities, rural areas and age groups (15–19, 20–39, 40–59, 59+). A simple random sample of persons aged 15 and over, living in private households, was selected from the Residents' Register in each stratum. For sections A-F of the questionnaire, interviews were conducted face to face using laptop computers (CAPI). The section on violence was filled in through self-completion in a paper questionnaire (PAPI).

Lithuania also conducted in 2000 the ICBS with a sample of 525 persons (one for each company) in Vilnius. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and is representative only at the city (capital) level. No information on response rate is available. The survey was conducted through face to face interviews. It was placed under the responsibility of the Law Institute, Criminological Research Department. It was financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.

Lithuania conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 515 individuals with Russian origins. The sample covered the cities of Vilnius and Visaginas, and the response rate was 90%.

LUXEMBOURG (LUXEMBOURG)

Luxembourg participated in the 2005 EU ICS with a national representative sample of 800 households and a 36.9% response rate. The interviews were carried out using CATI methodology.

The country participated in the Eurobarometer of Public Safety 44.3 (1996) with a sample of 600 interviews and in the Eurobarometers 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) with samples of about 1'000 interviews. The surveys were conducted face to face. Luxembourg also participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 with samples of 601 and 505 individuals respectively, interviewed face to face.

The police services of Luxembourg conducted in March 2007 a survey on feelings of insecurity. The survey used CATI methodology. The sample was selected through random digit dialling and it included 1'000 persons aged 12 or more. The sample was stratified according to age, gender, professional activity, nationality and regional area. It was representative at the national level.

Luxembourg also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 497 individuals with ex-Yugoslavian origins. The response rate was 78%.

MALTA (MALTA)⁷¹

Malta participated in the ICVS in 1997, but the survey remained unpublished and the database is not available. No other general victimisation surveys were carried out in the country.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 500 individuals interviewed face to face.

Malta conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 500 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. This country was an exception to the methodology of this survey, since it did not use the technique of random route selected clusters to create the sample. This is explained by the special living conditions of the ethnic minority studied. First, the researchers tried to interview people with North African origins in the Mosque, but this strategy only generated a few interviews. Finally, the vast majority of the interviews were conducted with people from Sub-Saharan origin in the common areas of the administrative detention semi-open centers in Malta, as it was not possible to access to closed centers. For this reason, the response rate was not calculated.

NETHERLANDS (NEDERLAND)⁷²

The Netherlands participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The country used national representative sample of 2,000, 2,000, 2,008, 2,001 and 2,010 households with response rates of 65%, 66%, 63%, 58%, and 46 respectively, and CATI methodology. In 2010, the Netherlands participated in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 respondents (2,000 achieved using CATI, and 2,000 using CAWI).

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

National victimisation surveys started in the Netherlands in 1974 under the responsibility of the Research and Documentation Center (WODC) of the Ministry of Justice (Van Dijk, Steinmetz, 1980). These surveys were later adopted by the CBS (Statistics Netherlands) that has been carrying out national victimisation surveys since 1980. These surveys are based on random samples taken from private households; they include questions on victimisation of various forms of crime asked to respondents aged 15 and older. During the period 1980 to 1992, the Crime Victim Survey (ESM) was held first annually and, from 1984 to 1992, biannually. From 1992 onwards, the ESM was succeeded by the Justice and Security Survey (ERV - *Enquête Rechtsbescherming en Veiligheid*). Since 2005, the ERV was replaced by the National Security Monitor (see below).

In 2005, the Netherlands introduced the annual National Security Monitor. The questionnaire integrated elements from the former POLS Justice Module and from the Police Monitor (see below). The 2005 survey was a small-scale (pilot) survey, and from 2006 on it was representative at the level of police regions. In 2005 it used a sample of 5,242 individuals and obtained a response rate of 70%. CATI and CAPI methodology

71 Main source: Azzopardi (2009).

72 Main source: Huls (2009), Pauwels & Pleysier (2007, 2008), Wittebrood (2008).

were applied, and the sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender and geographical area. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Statistics Netherlands, Division of Social and Spatial Statistics (SRS)/Statistical Analysis Heerlen (SAH). It was financed by the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations. The survey is conducted in cooperation between the ministries mentioned and Statistics Netherlands. The National Security Monitor was stopped in 2008 and replaced by the Integral Security Monitor. The survey is conducted with the same methodology as the former National Security Monitor. Fieldwork, research and analysis are under the responsibility of Statistics Netherlands (CBS). The police regions and municipalities are allowed to do the same survey with a standard questionnaire but CBS is responsible for the sample.

The Permanent Survey on Living Conditions (POLS - *Permanent Onderzoek Leefsituatie*) including a Justice and Security module was conducted from 1980 to 2005 (from 1980 to 1985 every year, and from 1986 to 1992 every two years). Between 1980 and 1992 different design and questionnaires were used; from 1992 to 1996 it was a separate continuous victim survey. This survey was discontinued in 2005. In 2004, it used a national representative sample of 10,552 individuals and obtained a response rate of 58%, using CAPI methodology. The sampling procedure was multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Statistics Netherlands.

Also a Police Monitor PMB is conducted in every police region since 1993. Originally, this survey was conducted every second year but, since 2001, it is conducted every year. The Police Monitor uses a very large sample that included 90,000 households in 2003 and 88,000 in the 2008 sweep. It uses telephone interviewing. The Police Monitor is placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (BZK) and the Ministry of Justice (B&A Group/Intomart, 2003).

In 2002-3 the Netherlands participated in the INSEC⁷³ study with a sample of 1,000 urban residents in two districts of Amsterdam. The survey was conducted by the Universities of Groningen and Leiden.

The Netherlands participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business. The country used a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade, industry and catering sector. CATI methodology was used. Response rate were 64% and 74% respectively for small and large industrial business, 76% and 72% for the catering sector with 1-10 or 11 and more employees respectively and 79% and 72% respectively for retail trade sector with 1-10 and 11 or more employees. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

Since 2004, the Netherlands also conducts annually a Business Crime Monitor survey. In 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 it was conducted within the following five sectors of industry in the Netherlands: construction (samples of 5,700, 6,400, 5,800, and 6,700), retail (samples of 8,800, 9,000, 11,800, and 10,700), hospitality (samples of 8,900, 9,500,

73 See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

6,200, and 6,600), transport (samples of 6,500, 3,900, 4,800, and 3,600), and financial and business services (samples of 7,800, 9,300, 9,000, and 10,100).

The country conducted in 1986 the first National Survey on the Prevalence of Wife Abuse in the Netherlands, with a representative sample of 1,016 women aged between 20 and 60 (Romkens, 1997). This survey was repeated in 1996, 1997 (among immigrants only), and 2009.

In 2006, the Netherlands also published the first Monitor Victims of Human Trafficking which included, among his sources, a series of surveys of victims of this type of crime (WODC, 2006).

The Netherlands also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 459 individuals with North African origins, 443 individuals with Turkish origins, and 471 individuals with Surinamese origins. The sample covered the cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. The response rate was 77%.

POLAND (POLSKA)⁷⁴

Poland participated in the ICVS in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS). In 1989, the survey was conducted in the city of Warsaw with a sample of 500 households. It was conducted through telephone interviewing. In 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS), Poland participated with national representative samples of 2,033, 3,482, 5,276 and 5,013 households, and obtained response rates of 96%, 94%, 78% and 72% respectively. In 2000 and 2004, the surveys used face to face interviews at the respondent home (with a paper questionnaire) and an adapted form of the ICVS questionnaire. Samples were selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, marital status, and geographical area. Surveys were financed by the Ministry of Sciences.

In 2005, another survey was carried out, only in Warsaw, using the ICVS questionnaire. It used a sample of 1,000 households and was conducted through face to face interviews. The response rate was 18%. The survey was financed by the Ministry of Sciences.

Poland participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Poland also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009 with a sample of 500 interviews carried out with CATI and 100 carried out with CAPI. The response rate was 22.1%. The pilot exercise was conducted by the Institute of Justice of Poland.

In 2002-3 the country participated in the INSEC⁷⁵ study with a sample of 1,088 urban residents in two districts of Krakow. The survey was conducted by the Jagiellonian Universities of Krakow.

The country participated in the IVAWS survey in 2004 with a sample size of 2,009 females and obtained a response rate of 87%. The survey used face to face interviews.

⁷⁴ Main source: Siemaszko (2009).

⁷⁵ See the description of the INSEC study in the chapter on Germany.

The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, and geographical area. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of Warsaw University, IPSiR (Institute of Social Prevention and Resocialisation), Chair of Criminology. It was financed by a grant of the Ministry of Science and Informatics of Poland.

Poland also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Roman origins. The response rate was 86%.

PORTUGAL (PORTUGAL)

Portugal participated in the ICVS in 2000 and 2004 (EU ICS) with national representative sample of 2,000 and 2,011 households, and obtained response rates of 56% and 43% respectively.

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Portugal also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The sample used was composed of 515 interviews. They were carried out with CATI (1/3 of the sample), CAPI+CATI (1/3 of the sample) and CAPI+CASI (1/3 of the sample). The response rate was 60%.

Portugal also conducted national Victimisation Surveys in 1991, 1992 and 1994. In 1994, a sample of 13,500 households was used. It was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variable used for the stratification was the geographical area and, a posteriori, a second stratification was made by gender and age in each of the geographical areas selected. The sample was representative at the national level. The survey did not use the ICVS questionnaire. Data collection was based on face to face interviews at the respondent's home using an electronic questionnaire (CAPI). The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Legal Policy and Planning Office of the Ministry of Justice, Justice Statistics Department. The National Statistics Institute provided expertise (Recasens i Brunet, 2008).

This country conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 505 individuals with Brazilian origins and 510 individuals with Sub-Saharan African origins. The sample covered the cities of Lisbon (metro area) and Setubal, and the response rate was 72%.

ROMANIA (ROMÂNIA)⁷⁶

Romania participated two times in the ICVS, in 1996 and 2000. In 1996 the country combined an urban sample of 1,000 households from the capital city, Bucharest, and a small rural sample of 91 households to reach a total sample of 1091 households. The survey was based on face to face interviews. In 2000, the country used a city sample (Bucharest) of 1'506 households. Interviews were conducted face to face and the response rate was 76.7%. The sample was representative at the city level. The surveys were placed under the responsibility of the Juridical Research Institute of the Romanian Academy, Public Law and Criminology Department.

In 2010, the country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against women 344 with a sample of 1,054 individuals interviewed face to face.

Starting in 2001, the National Institute of Statistics (Institutul Național de Statistică, INS) conducted annually the multipurpose Living Conditions Survey (*Condițiile de viață ale populației din România*, ACOVI). This survey included several questions on victimisation and used national representative samples of approximately 10,000 individuals. The variable used for the sample stratification was the geographical area. Interviews were conducted face to face, at the respondent's home, by filling a paper questionnaire. The last Living Conditions Survey was carried out in 2006, providing data for 2005. This survey has been replaced by the Quality of Life Survey (*Ancheta asupra calității vieții*, ACAV) harmonised with the European Survey Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) which, according to the regulations, do not include questions on victimisation. INS conducted also, in 2008, the Health Interview Survey (*Ancheta asupra sănătății*, SAN 2008), harmonised with the European Health Interview Survey, which includes questions on the extent of exposure at home or in the living area to crime, violence or vandalism and at the work place to harassment, bullying, discrimination, violence or threat of violence. The next Health Interview Survey will be carried out in 2014.

Romania also conducted in 2000 the ICBS with a sample of 500 persons (one for each company) in Bucharest. The sample was representative only at the city level. Face to face interviews were used. The survey was conducted by GALLUP and funding was provided by the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

Romania participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 600 individuals with Roma and Hungarian origins. Two main sampling frames were tested: Random digit dialling and focused enumeration and Random route cluster sampling. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Roma origins. The response rate was 64%.

⁷⁶ Main source: Istrate (2009).

SLOVAKIA (SLOVENSKO)

Slovakia participated as part of Czechoslovakia in the 1992 ICVS. The survey was conducted with a national representative sample of 1,821 households. The response rate was 91%. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, socio-professional qualifications, area of residence, regional distribution, and size of the population. Data were collected through face to face interviews conducted in June 1992 in the Czech and Slovak languages. The final sample for Slovakia consisted in 508 households. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Institute of Sociology and Social Prevention.

In 1997, the country participated in the ICVS with a sample of 1,105 households and obtained a response rate of 75.1%. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,032 individuals interviewed face to face.

Slovakia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The pilot exercise was conducted by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic (SO SR) using face to face interviews with paper and pencil questionnaires (PAPI). It used a purposive selected sample which assured a response rate of 100%. The sample was composed by 200 households (25 for each of the eight regions of the country) represented by one person aged 18 or older. The average duration of the survey was 1 hour and 32 minutes per respondents.

Slovakia participated in 2007 in the FRA's Pilot Victim Survey on Ethnic Minorities and Immigrants with a sample of 605 individuals with Roma and Hungarian origins. The interviews were conducted face to face with an interviewer filling out the questionnaire. In 2008, this country participated in the full-scale EU-MIDIS with a nationwide sample of 500 individuals with Roma origins. The response rate was 89%.

SLOVENIA (SLOVENIJA)

Slovenia conducted the ICVS in 1992, 1996 and 2001 with samples of 1,000, 2053 and 3,885 households respectively. In 1992, the sample was restricted to the capital city, Ljubljana, and combined CATI and CAPI methodology. In 1996, the country combined an urban (Ljubljana) sample of 1,107 households and a rural sample of 946 households, and applied CATI methodology. In 2000, the sample was representative at the national level and CATI methodology was used. The sample was selected using stratified random sampling. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Statistical Office of Republic of Slovenia (SORS), Social Services Statistics Department.

The country participated in the Special Eurobarometer on Domestic Violence Against Women 344 (2010) with a sample of 1,005 individuals interviewed face to face.

Slovenia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. A total of 1,084 interviews were conducted with CATI and 916 with CAPI, and the response rates obtained were 52% and 38% respectively. This pilot exercise was conducted by SORS.

This country also conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 473 individuals with Serbian origins and 528 individuals with Bosnian/Muslim origins. The sample covered the cities of Ljubljana and Jesenice, and the response rate was 64%.

SPAIN (ESPAÑA)⁷⁷

In the case of Spain, the distribution of powers between the Central Administration and the Autonomous Communities allow a distinction between victimisation surveys conducted in Catalonia and those conducted at the national level and in other autonomous communities.

National Level

Spain participated in the ICVS in 1989 and 2005 (EU ICS) with samples of 862 and 2,034 households and responses rates of 33% and 40% respectively. In 1989 the survey was conducted using CATI methodology in urban areas, while in rural areas where telephone penetration was too low interviews were taken face to face with some computer assistance. In 2005 it was conducted using CATI methodology. In 1989, in order to save costs, rural areas were selected applying standard national quota sampling instead of other methods of probability sampling. In 2005, the sample was representative at the national level.

Spain participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Spain also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2008/9. The pilot survey was conducted by the Cabinet of Interior Security Studies (GESI) and the National Statistical Institute (INE) and the field test was carried out by TNS-Demoscopia under the technical supervision of the INE. It targeted people aged 15-74 (both included), living in family units. Thus, people living alone were excluded from the survey. The geographical scope spanned over ten provinces out of 50. The pilot test sample was designed by the INE. The theoretical sampling size was 1,000 people; 10 for each of the 100 census sections targeted by the study. The households within a section were randomly selected. Once the households had been selected, questions regarding the number of people living in the household were posed, and the respondent was selected using a random number table. The data collection methods chosen were CAPI and CATI. CAPI interviews were conducted in 96 census sections and CATI in 4 sections. The overall response rate was 53.5%

Gondra Bustinza (2008) identifies also eight victimisation surveys conducted by the CIS (*Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas*), of which six were conducted at the national level (in 1978, 1980, 1991 and 1995), one in Madrid in 1980, and one with a sample of several cities in 1982. Apart from that, there was a study on terrorism and citizens' security conducted also by the CIS in 1987. The Barometer conducted periodically by the CIS cannot be considered as a victimisation survey as it only includes a couple of questions on citizens' concerns among which delinquency is often included.

⁷⁷ Main source: Recasens i Brunet (2008).

Table 4: Victimisation Surveys conducted by the CIS in Spain*

Year	Survey	Sample (N)	Territorial scope	CIS Study Number
1978	Study on criminality (Estudio sobre criminalidad)	1.204	Spain	1149
1978	Study on victimisation (Estudio sobre victimización)	5.706	Spain	1152
1980	Study on victimisation and drugs (Estudio sobre victimización y droga)	5.738	Spain	1206
1980	Study on citizens' insecurity 1 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 1)	1.156	Madrid	1251
1982	Study on citizens' insecurity 2 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 2)	3.714	Sample of cities	1313
1991	Study on citizens' insecurity 3 (Estudio sobre inseguridad ciudadana 3)	2.490	Spain	1974
1995	(Delinquency, security and police) Delincuencia, seguridad y policía	3.919	Spain	2200
1995	(Request for insecurity and victimisation) Demanda de Inseguridad y Victimización	14.994	Spain	2200

*Table adapted from Gondra Bustinza (2008) with additional information from Raldúa Martín (1996).

Since 1994, the Andalusian Institute of Criminology carried out a series of surveys at the local level in the Autonomous Community of Andalusia (García España, Pérez Jiménez, Benítez Jiménez, 2007, 2008); in 2009, the same institute conducted a national victimisation survey (Díez Ripollés & García España, 2009). All these surveys used the successive versions of the ICVS questionnaire, adapted to the Spanish case. The 2009 national survey was conducted through CATI with a sample of 1,400 households, and obtained a response rate of 28.8%. The sample included people aged 16 or older residing in capitals and municipalities with more than 50,000 inhabitants. The surveys conducted in the Autonomous Community of Andalusia took place in Málaga in 1994 and 2005, in Córdoba, Huelva and Seville in 2006, and in Almería, Cádiz, Granada and Jaén in 2007. A survey conducted in Seville in 2003 remains unpublished. The 1994 Malaga survey used a sample of 1,634 households combining face to face and telephone interviews. The rest of the surveys used CATI methodology and included persons aged 16 or older. The sample of the 2005 Malaga survey consisted in 1,343 interviews. The surveys of 2006 and 2007 used samples of 800 interviews in each city. The response rates were 17.2% (Córdoba), 15.1% (Huelva), 18.3% (Sevilla), 18.5% (Almería), 17.6% (Cádiz), 20% (Granada), and 19% (Jaén).

In 1994, a pilot survey for the first round of the ICBS/ICCS was conducted in the city of Málaga (Stangeland & Guzmán Muñoz, 1996). Another pilot, conducted in Seville, remained unpublished.

As far as school victimisation is concerned, the Attorney of the Spanish People (*Defensor del Pueblo español*) conducted, in cooperation with UNICEF, two surveys on school violence in 1999 and 2005-6. The sample included 3,000 secondary school students attending 300 institutions selected according to the following criteria: urban/rural,

public/private, and proportional distribution according to the Spanish Autonomous Regions (Defensor del Pueblo, 2007).

The country conducted the Violence Against Women Macro-Survey in 1999, 2002 and 2006, with national samples of 20,552, 20,652 and 32,426 females respectively. In 1999, the response rate was 44.1%. Face to face interviews and CATI methodology were used. The sample was selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were the geographical area and the degree of urbanisation. Oversampling was applied for Autonomous Communities (first regional level) with less population. The sample was representative at first regional and national level. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Instituto de la Mujer, Secretaría General de Políticas de Igualdad (Instituto de la Mujer, 1999, 2002, 2006; Meil, 2005).

Spain conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 514 individuals with North African origins, 504 individuals with South American origins, and 508 individuals with Romanian origins. The sample covered the cities of Madrid and Barcelona, and the response rate was 58%.

Catalonia (Catalunya)⁷⁸

Catalonia participated in the ICVS in 1996 and 2000. In 1996, the data arrived after the final deadline and therefore the region is not included in the main publications about the survey. In 2000, the survey used a sample of 2,909 households and the response rate was 73%. The survey was conducted using telephone interviewing but not CATI methodology. The sampling method was based in random sample from the telephone registry, and therefore does not account for households with non-registered telephone numbers. The survey was financed by the Autonomous Government of Catalonia and was co-ordinated for the Centre of Legal Studies, Ministry of Justice.

Catalonia also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009, with a sample size of 1,179 households, of which 707 were interviewed with CATI and 472 with CAPI. An extra module on violence was included using CASI methodology. The sample was representative of the population of Catalonia. For CATI, a random sample stratified by region, sex and age was used. For CAPI, a two-stage sample, involving the selection of census sections as first stage units (understood as conglomerates) and individuals as the final unit, was used. The face to face interviews were only held in the Barcelona metropolitan area. The sample design was provided by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Institutional Relations and Participation, and the Statistical Institute of Catalonia (IDESCAT). The response rate was 9.6% for CATI and 40.5% for CAPI.

Since 1999 a survey called Survey on Public Security in Catalonia is conducted annually. The sample is representative of the population of Catalonia. In 1999, the survey pilot used a non-representative sample of 5,320 households. In 2000, the first survey used a sample of 12,806 households. In 2001, the sample was composed of 12,617 households (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2002). Moreover, from 1983 to 2001, a victimisation survey called Survey on Public Security in Barcelona was conducted annually in the city of Barcelona. Since 2002, the Survey on Public Security in Barcelona and the Survey on Public Security in Catalonia are conducted together under the name of the latter. In 2002, the survey used a sample of 18,679 households. The survey is conducted using CATI

78 Main sources: Recasens i Brunet (2008), Robert (2005).

methodology. The sample is selected using multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification are age, gender, and geographical area. The sample is representative at the first regional level. The survey is placed under the responsibility of the Government of Catalonia (*Generalitat de Catalunya*), Department of Justice and Interior.

SWEDEN (SVERIGE)

Sweden participated in the ICVS in 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were composed by 1,707, 1,000, 2,000 and 2,012 households and the response rates were 77%, 75%, 66%, and 55% respectively. Samples were selected using simple probability sampling and they were representative at the national level. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology

The country participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000), 58.1 (2002), and in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of about 1,000 individuals interviewed face to face.

Sweden also conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009. The exercise was conducted by the National Council for Crime Prevention in Sweden (BRA), using CATI methodology. The sample was drawn from the Total Population Register maintained by Statistics Sweden, which includes all those permanently resident in Sweden at the time of the sampling (thus, the sample did not exclude persons who lack a landline telephone). The age-range of the sample was 16 to 79 years (both included).

Sweden also participated in 2008-9 in the first pilot of the ICVS-2. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The country used a total sample of 381 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (117 households for CAWI and 204 households for PAPI) and 205 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI the overall response rate was 25.4%. In particular, the response rates were 11.8% for the CAWI methodology (7.1% when the questionnaire was included and 15.9% when an answer card was included⁷⁹), 13.6% for the PAPI methodology (25.1% when the questionnaire was included and 2.1% when an answer card was included) and 16.9% for CATI methodology. In 2010, the country also participated in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 households.

From a historical point of view, the first Swedish victimisation surveys took place in the early 1970s, when the Scandinavian Criminological Research Council funded a series of surveys on victimisation for violent crime and property crime in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden (see the chapter on Denmark, with references).

Since 1978, the country conducts annually the multipurpose survey called Living Conditions Survey (ULF), that includes a module on victimisation. In 2005, the sample size consisted in 6000 households and the response rate was 78%. The sample was selected using simple probability sampling and is representative at the national and the first regional level and an *ad-hoc* questionnaire was used. The survey was conducted using face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire. The

79 See the description of the ICVS-2 Pilot Study included in the first part of this article.

survey is placed under the responsibility of Statistics Sweden, Department of Population and Welfare Statistics. The Institute of Criminology of Stockholm University, The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, and The National Board of Health and Welfare provided expertise.

Since 2006, the country carries out an annual victimisation survey called the Swedish Crime Survey (NTU). It covers population aged 16-79 and includes questions on victimisation, fear of crime and public confidence in the justice system. In 2006, the national representative sample included almost 8,000 individuals, while subsequent waves of data collection have been conducted using twice the sample size, which has resulted in almost 15,000 respondents annually (BRA, 2009). According to BRA (2009): "interviews are conducted by Statistics Sweden (Statistiska Centralbyrån), mainly by telephone. An abridged version of the questionnaire is sent to those who cannot be reached, or who decline to participate by phone. [...] The response rate is relatively high; just over three quarters of the individuals in the sample have participated in the survey." For example, in 2006, the response rate was 78%.

The country carried out between October 1999 and January 2000 a multipurpose survey called Captured Queen: Men's Violence Against Women in "Equal" Sweden. This survey used a sample of 1,000 females and obtained a response rate of 70%. The sample was selected through multistage probability sampling. The variables used for the stratification were age, gender, marital status, geographical area and degree of urbanisation. The sample was representative at the national level. The methodology was based on self-administered questionnaires sent by the post. The survey was placed under the responsibility of the Feminist Studies in Social Sciences, Uppsala University. It was financed by the Crime Victim Compensation and Support Authority. The National Centre for Battered and Raped Women, Statistics Sweden provided expertise.

The country conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 494 individuals with Iraqi origins and 506 individuals with Somali origins in the cities of Stockholm and Malmö. The response rate was 17%.

SWITZERLAND⁸⁰

Switzerland participated in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000, and 2005. Indeed, the country conducted six national victimisation surveys, of which four were placed under the umbrella of the ICVS. These surveys took place in 1984/7, 1989, 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2005. All of them were conducted by the School of Criminal Sciences of the University of Lausanne, and used CATI.

The first national Swiss crime survey was conducted in two phases in 1984 (French-speaking cantons) and in 1987 (German-speaking cantons and the Italian-speaking canton), with a sample of 6,505 respondents (Killias, 1989). That survey was one of the first major victim surveys conducted using CATI and the structure used for the temporal location of the events was later included in the development of what became the International Crime Victim Survey or ICVS (van Dijk, Mayhew and Killias 1990). Since then, Swiss national victimisation surveys have followed the methodology of the ICVS. In 1989 and 1996, Switzerland opted for the a sample of 1,000 randomly selected

80 Main sources: Haymoz, Aebi, Killias & Lamon (2009), Killias (1989), Killias, Haymoz & Lamon (2007).

households; in 2000 and 2005, the samples were of 4,234 and 3,898 households respectively. The 1998 national survey was conducted on a sample of 3,041 respondents following the methodology of the 1996 wave of the ICVS. In the surveys of 1998, 2000, and 2005, certain city areas were overrepresented in order to increase the number of respondents from immigrant communities and allow a more detailed analysis of this group of the population.

The surveys of 1984, 1987, 1998 and 2005 were funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. The surveys of 1989, 1996 were funded by the Justice Federal Office. The 2000 survey was funded by the Justice Federal Office, the Federal Police Office and the Federal Statistical Office. The seventh Swiss national crime survey will take place in 2011.

The country participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICCS with a national representative sample. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business. The country used a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade, industry and catering sector. Interviews were conducted through CATI. The survey was conducted by the School of Criminal Sciences of the University of Lausanne.

Switzerland also participated in the IVAWS in 2004. A total of 1,975 women aged 18 or more (but younger than 70), were interviewed (namely 1,351 in German-speaking and 623 French-speaking parts of Switzerland). The computer randomly selected home phone numbers in German-speaking and French-speaking Switzerland. The response rate was 59%. The random sample was selected on the basis of the national telephone company file, and regions and towns/villages were represented according to their population. The survey was conducted by the School of Criminal Sciences of the University of Lausanne (Killias, Simonin & De Puy, 2005).

UNITED KINGDOM⁸¹

In the United Kingdom, the General Household Survey was the first survey that covered victimisation issues. This multipurpose survey, conducted during the 1970s, included some questions about domestic burglaries victimisation (Hough, 2009). Since 1982, the United Kingdom has carried out periodically the British Crime Survey (BCS).

According to Hough and Norris (2008) the first BCS was conducted in 1982 and included data covering England, Wales and Scotland. Fieldwork in Scotland was conducted by the same company as that in England and Wales and used an identical questionnaire – though it covered only the (densely populated) southern part of Scotland. The absolute sample size was smaller in Scotland although the sampling fraction was much larger (5,000 for a population of 5 million as opposed to 10,000 for a population of 50 million). In the 1980s the BCS was conducted three times in England and Wales (in 1982, 1984 and 1988) and twice in Scotland (1982 and 1988). No crime survey data for Northern Ireland was collected in the 1980s, reflecting funding constraints and the priority that security issues attracted at that time. The 1990s saw increasing divergence between the English and Scottish surveys (see the details under the headings England & Wales and Scotland).

81 Main sources: Hough (2009), Hough & Norris (2008), Walker (2008).

The United Kingdom participated in the Eurobarometers of Public Safety 44.3 (1996), 54.1 (2000) and 58.1 (2002) with samples of 1,300 interviews conducted face to face, of which 1,000 in Great Britain (England & Wales and Scotland) and 300 in Northern Ireland. The United Kingdom participated in the Special Eurobarometers on Domestic Violence Against Women 51.0 (1999) and 344 (2010) with samples of 1,356 and 1,322 individuals respectively, interviewed face to face.

The United Kingdom also participated in the first pilot of the ICVS-2. Two methodologies were used for the pilot exercise: CATI and a combination of CAWI and PAPI. The country used a total sample of 175 households for CAWI and PAPI methodology (48 households for CAWI and 127 households for PAPI) and 200 households for CATI methodology. For CAWI and PAPI the overall response rate was 14.6%. In particular, the response rates were 4% for the CAWI methodology (2.5% when the questionnaire was included and 5.5% when an answer card was included), 10.6% for the PAPI methodology (19.5% when the questionnaire was included and 1.7% when an answer card was included) and 5.2% for CATI methodology. In 2010, the United Kingdom participated also in the second ICVS-2 pilot study with a sample of 4,000 households interviewed.

England and Wales

England and Wales participated in the five sweeps of the ICVS, in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 2,006, 2,001, 2,171, 1,947, and 1,775 households with response rates of 43%, 38%, 59%, 57%, and 43%. In 2005, the main sample included a subsample for the city of London composed by 874 households.

As mentioned before (see United Kingdom) the British Crime Survey (BCS) started in 1982, but since the 1990s there are important differences between the survey conducted in England and Wales and the survey conducted in Scotland. According to Hough and Norris (2008), in England and Wales the BCS was conducted every other year from 1992 onwards. The BCS had a steadily increasing sample size. The core sample size for the 2000 BCS was around 20,000. Booster samples aimed at providing accurate data about ethnic minorities and young people were also regularly included. The increased sample size also allowed respondents to be split into smaller samples who were asked questions about different topics (victimisation questions are always asked of the full sample). The interview strategy of the BCS was changed in 1994 to one using CAPI and CASI rather than PAPI. The survey is continuous since 2001 (monthly interviews), with samples of 40,000 interviews per year, and applies calibration weighting.

According to HEUNI (2007), in 2004-5 the sample of the BCS was approximately 51,000 persons. "Information was collected on persons living in private households and aged 16 and more. The mode of data collection was CAPI and CASI. The sampling procedure was a multistage probability sample and variables used for the stratification were geographical area, social class of head of household and population density. Oversampling was applied for certain groups of persons/areas like small police force areas, ethnic minority groups and people aged 16-24. The response rate was 75% in 2004. In the case of non-response, no basic information was collected and no new target person was selected, but proxies were allowed in the case of language difficulties. Training of the interviewers, repeated calls and an advance letter containing a token

incentive were applied to reduce non-response. The sample was representative at national level and at first and second regional level.”

In 2001, the BCS included a detailed self-completion questionnaire designed to ascertain the extent and nature of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking for England and Wales. It also included questions on sexual assault against men, as well as questions allowing a clear distinction between different forms of sexual assault and the overlaps between domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking. A national representative sample of 22,463 women and men aged 16-59 were asked, via a computerised self-completion questionnaire (CASI), whether they had been subject to domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking during their lifetime and during the preceding year. Those who had been subject to such incidents were asked details about their experiences, enabling distinctions to be made between levels and overlaps of the three forms of violence, the identification of risk factors associated with such violence, the impact it had on people's lives, and the manner in which people sought help. Self-completion modules on domestic violence (1996 BCS), sexual victimisation (1998 and 2000 BCS) and stalking (1998 BCS) have also been included in different waves of the BCS.

At the local level, Hough (2009) notes that the first victimisation survey was conducted in the early 1970s, in London, by the Institute of Criminology of Cambridge, and it was funded by the Home Office (Sparks, Genn & Dodd, 1977). In 1975, another survey was conducted in the city of Sheffield, whose results were published twelve years later (Bottoms, Mawby & Walker, 1987). Subsequently, a survey on crime, victimisation, police and fear of crime was conducted in London (Smith, 1983). Other victimisation surveys, with a methodology inspired by the BCS, were conducted in the county of Nottingham (Farrington & Dowds, 1985), in Merseyside (Kinsey, 1984) and in the London Borough of Islington (Jones, MacLean & Young, 1986). In 2002, the survey conducted by Smith (1983) was replicated, adapting it slightly in order to use with a subsample of the BCS in London (Fitzgerald et al., 2002).

It should be mention that the Youth Lifestyle Survey is a survey on self-reported crime, but includes also questions on victimisation experienced by the people surveyed. So far, this survey has been conducted twice, in 1992-3 and in 1998-9, with subsamples of the BCS corrected to include younger individuals, and using PAPI. The samples were composed by young people aged 14 to 25 and 12 to 30 respectively. Thus, for the 1998-9 survey, 4,848 youths were interviewed and the response rate was 69% (Flood Page et al., 2000).

England and Wales participated in 1994 in the first round of the ICBS/ICCS A total of 7,558 companies were interviewed. A random sample was drawn from the business population, stratified according to the size and type of business (using a random selection of companies of 1-10 and 11 or more employees in the retail trade). CATI methodology was used. Response rate was between 82% for companies with 1-10 employees and 77% for companies with 11 or more employees. The survey was carried out by the Home Office and placed under the responsibility of the Dutch Ministry of Justice. In England and Wales, this survey was renamed as the Commercial Victimisation Survey and was repeated in 2002 with some methodological changes (Shury et al., 2005). In this case, the sample included 6,516 companies surveyed by telephone (CATI), and a qualitative study based on 40 interviews was added. For telephone interviews, the

response rate was 61% and the average length was 20 minute per interview. A third edition of this survey is currently being planned.

In 2008 England conducted in 2008 the EU-MIDIS with a sample of 1,042 individuals with Central and Eastern European origins. The sample covered the city of London, and the response rate was 21%.

Northern Ireland⁸²

Northern Ireland participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS). The samples were respectively of 2,000, 1,042, 1,565, and 2,002 households. The response rate for 1989 is not available, but in 1996, 2000, and 2005 the response rates were 84%, 81%, and 41% respectively. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology.

The country also conducts periodically the Northern Ireland National Crime Survey (NICS). This survey was conducted in 1994/95, 1998, 2001 and 2003/4 with samples of approximately 3,000 households, representative at the national level, and using CAPI and CASI methodology. Since 2005, the survey is continuous –following the model of the BCS in England and Wales– and the sample includes 6,420 households in which one person aged 16 or older is randomly selected and interviewed. The questionnaire of the NICS follows closely the one used for the BCS.

Scotland

Scotland participated four times in the ICVS, in 1989, 1996, 2000 and 2005 (EU ICS) with samples of 2,007, 2,194, 2,040, and 2,010 households, and obtained response rates of 41%, 63%, 58%, and 47% respectively. The surveys were conducted using CATI methodology.

According to the Scottish Government (2009): “Crime surveys have been carried out in Scotland since the early 1980s. In 1982 and 1988, the SCS formed part of the BCS. In 1993, however, the first independent SCS was run in Scotland and was repeated in 1996, 2000 and 2003. The SCS is referred to by the year in which data were collected rather than the year to which the data refer. In June 2004, the Scottish Executive commissioned the Scottish Crime and Victimisation Survey (SCVS), a new survey of victimisation in Scotland. In two distinct ways the SCVS was significantly different from previous sweeps of the SCS that had been undertaken in Scotland since 1993. First, the sample size was increased from 5,000 interviews every three years to an annual sample of 27,000 with continuous interviewing. More importantly, the survey method was changed from a face to face survey to a telephone survey (CATI). These changes were the outcome of a fundamental review of the SCS undertaken in 2003 and the change of data collection method represented the potential for change in the data series established by the SCS. Reflecting this, the Scottish Executive commissioned MORI Scotland and TNS Social to undertake a parallel face to face survey designed as a repeat of the previous waves of the SCS, although with a smaller sample of 3,000 interviews, to provide a measure of victimisation against which the telephone survey could be compared. In addition to the 3,000 full SCS interviews, 2,000 additional short

82 Main source: Northern Ireland Statistics & Research Agency (2009), Statistics and Research Branch of the Northern Ireland Office (2009)

interviews were conducted to bring the total number of adults providing the self-completion data that had been a feature of the previous SCS up to 5,000.”

In April 2008, the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) replaced the SCVS. Interviews for the SCJS began in April 2008 and ran continuously until March 2010. The survey involved interviewing a random sample of adults in 16,000 households across Scotland per year (Scottish Government, 2009).

The SCJS follows the BCS and NICS (see the chapter on Northern Ireland) in moving to a continuous collection methodology, and the questionnaire is similar but not identical to that of the BCS (Hough and Norris, 2008).

SUMMARY OF THE SITUATION IN EUROPE

Table 5 summarises the information presented in this article. It indicates the participation of each country in international and European surveys (ICVS, EU-ICS, ICVS-2 pilot studies, pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module in 2009, Eurobarometer, IVAWS, ICBS / ICCS, and the pilot study and EU-MIDIS survey), national periodical and non-periodical surveys on household and personal victimisation, businesses victimisation, and violence against women. The table also shows the methodology used for data collection, introducing a distinction between CATI and other methodologies.

Table 5 uses the following abbreviations in the heading:

ICVS : International Crime Victims Survey, EU ICS, Pilots ICVS-2

Pilot EU 2009 : Pilot Study on the EU victimisation survey module

EB : Euro-barometer

N.S. periodical : Periodical National Survey

N.S. non-periodical : Other national surveys (non periodical)

ICBS : International Crime Business Survey (ICBS/ ICCS)

N.S. Business National Crime Business Survey

IVAWS : International Violence Against Women Survey

N.S. VAW : National surveys on violence against women

EU : MIDIS : European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey

CATI : Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing

Other : Other than CATI method of interviewing

Table 5: Summary of Victimisation Surveys in Europe.

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Austria	1996 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	Yes	CAPI
Belgium	1989 1992 2000 2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Security Monitor: 1997; (biannual since 1998) APS-SCV (annual since 1996) (Flanders)	No	No	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	Yes	
Bulgaria	1997 2002 2004	No	2010	IVCS: 2005 2007 2008 2009	2004	2000	2002 2004 2005	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	No	PAPI
Cyprus	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	No	CAPI CASI PAPI
Czech Republic	1992 1996 2000	Yes	2010	No	2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2006	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	PAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Denmark	2000 2005 Piloto ICVS- 2 2010	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	National Victimization Survey. Started in 1996. (Annual since 2005)	2007	No	No	2003	No	2008	Yes	
Estonia	1993 1995 2000 2004 2009	No	2010	ICVS: 1993 1995 2000 2005 2009	No	No	1998	No	No	2008	No	CAPI
Finland	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Finnish National Safety Survey: 1980 1988 1993 1997 2003 2006 2009	No	1994	1996 1997	No	1997 2005	2008	Yes	F to F
France	1989 1996 2000 2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Living Conditions of Households Survey (annual from 1996 to 2006) Framework of Live and Security (annual since 2005)	1986	1994	No	No	2000	2008	Yes	CAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Germany	1989 2005 Pilots ICVS- 2 2008-9 2010	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	1991 1992 1995 1997 2003	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	
Greece	1991 2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	2001	No	No	2003	No	2008	Yes	F to F
Hungary	1996 2005	Yes	2010	No	2004 2006	1994 2000	No	No	No	2008	Yes	F to F
Ireland	2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	The Quarterly National Households Survey (1998, 2003, 2006 2009) Garda Public Attitudes Survey (annual since 2002)	1996	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	F to F

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Italy	1992 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	The Italian Citizens' Safety Survey (every five years since 1997-98) Everyday Life Aspects (annual from 1993 to 2003)	1991	1994	No	No	2006	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	Yes	PAPI
Latvia	1995 1998 2000	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Lithuania	1996/7 2000 2005	Yes	2010	No	No	2000	No	No	No	2008	No	PAPI CAPI
Luxembourg	2005	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	2007	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	F to F
Malta	1997	No	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	No	F to F

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Netherlands	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005 Piloto ICVS 2 2010	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	National Victimisation Surveys (periodical from 1974 to 1980) Crime Victim Survey (ESM) (periodical from 1980 to 2005). Permanent Survey on Living Conditions (periodical from 1980 to 2005) National Security Monitor (annual from 2005 to 2008) Integral Security Monitor (annual since 2009) Police Monitor (From 1993 to 2001 every second year. Since 2001 yearly)	No	1994	Annual since 2004	No	1986 1996 1997 2009	2008	Yes	CAPI
Poland	1989 1992 1996 2000 2004	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	2004	No	2008	No	PAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S. Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Portugal	2000 2004	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	1991 1992 1994	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Romania	1996 2000	No	2010	Living Conditions Survey (2001-2006)	No	2000	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008	No	PAPI
Slovakia	1992 1997	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	Pilot Study (2007) 2008		F to F
Slovenia	1992 1996 2001	Yes	2010	No	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI
Spain (National level)	1989 2005	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	No	2009	No	No	No	1999 2002 2006	2008	yes	CAPI
Spain (Catalonia)	1996 2000	Yes	See Spain	Survey on Public Security in Catalonia (annual since 1999).	No	No	No	No	See Spain	2008	Yes	CAP

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Sweden	1992 1996 2000 2005 Pilots ICVS- 2 2008-9 2010	Yes	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	Living Conditions Survey (annual since 1978) Swedish Crime Survey (annual since 2006)	No	No	No	No	1999/ 2000	2008	Yes	CAWI PAPI
United Kingdom	1989 1996 2000 2004 Pilots ICVS- 2 2008-9 2010	No	1996 1999 2000 2002 2010	British Crime Survey (periodical from 1982)	No	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAPI CAWI CASI
United Kingdom: England and Wales	1989 1992 1996 2000 2005	No	See United Kingdo m	British Crime Survey (continuous since 2001)	No	1994	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CASI CAPI PAPI CAWI
United Kingdom: Northern	1989 1996 2000	No	See United Kingdo	Northern Irelands Crime Survey (periodical since 1994)	No	No	No	No	No	2008	Yes	CASI CAPI

Country	ICVS	Pilot EU 2009	EB	N. S. Periodical	N. S. Non Periodical	ICBS	N. S. Business	IVAWS	N. S Violence Against Women	EU-MIDIS	CATI	Other
Ireland	2005		m									
United Kingdom: Scotland	1989 1996 2000 2005	No	See United Kingdom	Scottish Crime Survey (periodical since 1993)	No		No	No	No	2008	Yes	CAP CASI

CONCLUSION

In this paper we reviewed the victimisation surveys conducted in Europe Union Member States since the first ones carried out in Scandinavia in the 1970s to the most recent international ones. In the following paragraphs, we summarize the information on those surveys that used mainly national representative samples.

Twenty-six countries have participated in at least one of the five rounds of the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), conducted in 1989, 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004-5 (EU ICS in some countries). Cyprus is the only European country that has never participated in the ICVS. On the other hand, Bulgaria and Estonia are currently using the ICVS as its National Crime Survey.

In 2009 two pilot studies, whose main objective is to develop a questionnaire that can be used regularly at the European level, has been conducted. On the one hand, sixteen countries and the autonomous community of Catalonia conducted the pilot study on the EU victimisation survey module. On the other hand, Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England and Wales) have participated in 2008-9 in the first pilot study of ICVS-2, using a shortened version of the ICVS questionnaire. A second pilot study of the ICVS-2 was conducted in 2010 with the participation of Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England & Wales and Scotland).

Three Eurobarometers (in 1996, 2000 and 2002) have included questions on victimisation experiences and fear of crime, and two other Eurobarometers (in 1999 and 2010) included questions on violence against women. The first fifteen EU Members participated in the ones conducted in 1996, 1999, 2000 and 2002, while the current twenty-seven members participated in the one carried out in 2010.

At the same time, twelve countries and the autonomous region of Catalonia have set up regular national surveys. Thus, Belgium applies the Security Monitor since 1997, which is carried out biannually since 1998. Bulgaria has used the ICVS as a national survey in 1997, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2008 and 2009. The same applies to Estonia, which has used it in 1993, 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2009. Catalonia conducts annually, since 1999, the Survey on Public Security in Catalonia. Denmark has a national victimisation survey that was carried out by the first time in 1996 and is carried out annually since 2005. Finland applies the Finnish National Survey, conducted regularly since 1980. France used the Living Conditions of Households survey between 1996 and 2006, and carries out the Framework of Life and Security survey annually since 2005. Ireland included a module of victimisation within the Quarterly National Household Survey every three years since 1998 and, since 2002, conducts annually the Garda Public Attitudes Survey. Italy conducts the Italian Citizens' Safety Survey every five years since 1997-8 and includes questions about the perception of risk in its annual survey Everyday Life Aspects since 1993. The Netherlands introduced a national victimisation survey in 1974 whose methodology and denomination has changed many times over the years. Thus, between 1974 and 1980 it was called the National Victimization Survey; from 1980 to 2005, the Crime Victim Survey; from 2005 to 2008, the National Security Monitor; and, since 2009, the Integral Security Monitor. Between 1980 and 2005, the Netherlands also conducted the Permanent Survey on Living Conditions. Finally, the Police Monitor was conducted biannually between 1993 and 2001, and on an annual basis since then. Romania

conducted the Living Conditions Survey from 2001 to 2006. The United Kingdom conducts periodically the British Crime Survey (BCS) since 1982. In England and Wales, the BCS became continuous in 2001. In Scotland, the questionnaire and the methodology were modified on several occasions, and the BCS was renamed the Scottish Crime Survey in 1993, the Scottish Crime and Victimization Survey in 2004, and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey in 2008. An adaptation of the BCS is carried out periodically in Northern Ireland since 1994 under the name Northern Ireland Crime Survey. Finally, Sweden includes a module on victimisation in its annual Living Conditions Survey since 1978, and conducts also annually the Swedish Crime Survey since 2006.

In addition, twelve countries have conducted sporadically one or more national victimisation surveys: the Czech Republic, Germany, Bulgaria, Denmark, Spain, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg and Portugal.

Three countries participated in the International Violence against Women Survey (IVAWS): Denmark (2003), Greece (2003) and Poland (2004), and six countries have conducted national surveys of violence against women: Finland (1997 and 2005), France (2000), Italy (2006), the Netherlands (1996, 1997 and 2009), Spain (1999, 2002 and 2006), and Sweden (1999 and 2000).

Regarding the victimisation of businesses, eleven countries participated in one or both rounds of the ICBS/ICCS. In some countries, urban samples were used. That was the case of Czech Republic (1994), Bulgaria (2000), Finland (1994), France (1994), Germany (1994), Hungary (1994 and 2000), Italy (1994), Lithuania (2000), the Netherlands (1994), Romania (2000), and the United Kingdom (England and Wales, 1994). Four countries have conducted national surveys on the victimisation of businesses: Bulgaria (2002, 2004 and 2005), Estonia (1998), Finland (1996 and 1997) and the Netherlands (annual survey since 2004).

Finally, as far as the victimisation of ethnic minorities is concerned, six countries conducted the pilot study of the EU-MIDIS in 2006/7 (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Slovakia, Italy and Romania), while the 27 EU countries participated in the EU-MIDIS survey in 2009.

REFERENCES

- Aebi, M.F. (2009). Self-reported delinquency surveys in Europe. In Zauberman R. (Ed.). *Self-Reported Crime and Deviance Studies in Europe* (pp.11-49). Brussels: VUBPRESS Brussels University Press.
- Aebi M.F., and Linde, A. (2009). Review of the current situation in respect of the collection of survey data on victimisation. Report. Lausanne: Université de Lausanne.
- Aebi M.F., Aromaa K., Aubusson de Cavarlay B., Barclay G., Gruszczynska B., von Hofer H., Hysi V., Jehle J.-M., Killias M., Smit P. and Tavares C. (2006). *European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2006*. 3rd edition. Den Haag: Boom Juridische Uitgevers. [Onderzoek en beleid series, no 241, Ministry of Justice, Research and Documentation Center (WODC)] (173 p., ISBN 10 90 5454 733 2). Available online at: http://www.europeansourcebook.org/esb3_Full.pdf
- Ahven, A. (2008). The new Estonian National Victimisation Survey-Objectives and Needs of Knowledge. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.78-84). Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Ahven, A. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A. (1998). *Victims of Crime in the Developing countries*. UNICRI. Publication n° 57. Rome.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A. (2004a). The International Business Survey: Findings from nine central-Eastern European Cities. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 10, 137–161.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A. (2004b). *Towards comparable information on crime and victimisation. The International Crime Victim Survey and the International Crime Business Survey*. Working paper n° 7. 1 November 2004.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A. and van Kesteren, J. N. (2002). Criminal Victimization in Eastern-Central Europe. In: Nieuwbeerta (ed.) *Crime Victimization in comparative perspective. Results from the International Crime Victims Survey, 1989-2000*. Den Haag: Boom juridische uitgevers, pp.53-66.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A. and van Kesteren, J. (2004). *Criminal Victimization in Urban Europe. Key findings of the 2000 International Crime Victims Survey*. Turin. UNICRI.
- Alvazzi del Frate, A., Zvekic, U. and van Dijk, J. J. M. (Eds.) (1993). *Understanding Crime Experiences of Crime and Crime Control*. Acts of the International Conference. Rome, 18-20 November 1992. Edited by UN Publication, No.49. Rome, August 1993.
- Anttila, I. (1964). The Criminological Significance of Unregistered Criminality. *Excerpta Criminologica* 4: 411-414.
- Aromaa, K. (1971). *Arkkipaivan Vakivaltaa Suomessa [Everyday Violence in Finland]*. Helsinki: Institute of Criminology. Series M: 11.
- Aromaa, K. (1974a). Victimization to Violence: A Gallup Survey. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 2: 333-346
- Aromaa, K. (1974b). *The Replication of a Survey on Victimization to Violence*. Helsinki: Institute of Criminology. Series M: 36.
- Aromaa, K. (2004). *The International Violence Against Women Survey*. Statistical Commission and UN Economic Commission for Europe. Conference of European Statisticians. Working paper n 9. Geneva: HEUNI.

- Aromaa, K. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (1992). *The Victims of Crime 1992: preliminary Finnish data from the 1992 International Crime Victimization Survey*. Helsinki: National Research Institute of Legal Policy.
- Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (Eds.) (2008). *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007*. Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Aromaa, K., Heiskanen, M., Laaksonen, S. and Viuhko, M. (2007). Final Report for action entitled "Crime and Victimisation Surveys". Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Aromaa, K. and Leppä, S. (1973). *Omaisuusrikosten Yksilöuhrien Tarkastelua [A Survey on Individual Victims of Property Crimes]*. Helsinki: Institute of Criminology. Series M:26.
- Azzopardi J. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- B&A Group/Intomart (2003). *Police Monitor Population (2003); National Report*. The Hague/Hilversum: B&A groep/Intomart.
- Barbagli, M (1995). *L'occasione e l'uomo ladro: Furti e rapine in Italia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bezlov, T., Gounev, P., Hristov, H., Stoyanov, A., Yordanova, M. and Markov, D. (2006). *Crime Trends in Bulgaria 2000-2005*. Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD). Sofia, 2006.
- Bottoms, A.E., Mawby R.I. & Walker, M.A. (1987). A Localised Crime Survey in Contrasting Areas of a City. *British Journal of Criminology* 27(2): 125-154.
- BRA – The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (2008). *The Swedish Crime Survey 2007. Victimisation, Fear of crime and Public Confidence in the criminal Justice System*. Stockholm: The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå).
- De Schorlemer, L. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Defensor del Pueblo (2007). *Violencia escolar: el maltrato entre iguales en la Educación secundaria obligatoria 1999-2006*. Madrid: Defensor del Pueblo.
- Didier, E., Névanen S., Robert Ph. and Zauberman R. (2009). La solidité des institutions. Les statistiques de « victimation » de l'Insee (1996-2006), *Genèses* 2009/1, N° 74, 128-144.
- Díez Ripollés, J.L. and García España, E. (2009). *Encuesta a víctimas en España*. Málaga: Instituto Andaluz Interuniversitario de Criminología / Cajasol.
- Ditton, J. and Farrall, S. (Eds.) (2000). *The Fear of Crime*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- European Commission (1996). *Standard Eurobarometer (EB) 44.3 (1996)*. European Union; European Commission. Public Opinion.
- European Commission (1999). *Special Eurobarometer. Europeans and their Views on Domestic Violence against Women* [as part of the (EB) 51.0]. European Union: European Commission. Public Opinion.
- European Commission (2000). *Standard Eurobarometer (EB) 54.1 (autumn 2000)*. European Union: European Commission. Public Opinion.
- European Commission (2002). *Standard Eurobarometer (EB) 58.1 (autumn 2002)*. European Union: European Commission. Public Opinion.
- European Commission (2010). *Special Eurobarometer n°344: Domestic Violence Against Women*. [Standard Eurobarometer (EB) 73.2]. European Union: European Commission. Public Opinion.

- EUROSTAT (2009). *Project on Translating and Testing a EU Victimisation Survey Module*. Working Group, Statistics on Crime and criminal justice. Luxembourg, 19-20 February 2009.
- Farrington, D.P. and Dowds, E.A. (1985). Disentangling Criminal Behaviour and Police Reaction. In Farrington, D.P. and Gunn, J. (Eds.). *Reaction to Crime: The Public, the Police, Courts and Prisons* (pp. 41-72). Chichester: John Wiley.
- Fitzgerald, M., Hough, M., Joseph, I. and Qureshi T. (2002). *Policing for London*. Collumpton: Willan Publishing.
- Flood Page, C., Campbell, S., Harrington, V. and Miller, J. (2000). *Youth Crime: Findings from the 1998/99 Youth Lifestyles Survey*. Home Office Research Study 209. London: Home Office.
- FRA –European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2009). EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey. Technical Report: Methodology, Sampling and Fieldwork. [Vienna]: FRA.
- García España, E., Pérez Jiménez, F., and Benítez Jiménez, M.J. (2007). *La delincuencia en Córdoba, Huelva and Sevilla: Una encuesta de victimización*. Málaga: Instituto Andaluz Interuniversitario de Criminología / Cajasol.
- García España, E., Pérez Jiménez, F., Benítez Jiménez M.J. (2008). *La delincuencia en las capitales andaluzas: Encuestas de victimización en Andalucía – Especial referencia a Almería, Cádiz, Granada y Jaén*. Málaga: Instituto Andaluz Interuniversitario de Criminología / Cajasol.
- Garrido, V., Stangeland, P. and Redondo, S. (2001). *Principios de criminología*. 2ª edición. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch.
- Generalitat de Catalunya - Departament de Justícia i Interior (2002). *Encuesta de Seguridad Pública de Cataluña*. Barcelona: Departament de Justícia i Interior, Generalitat de Catalunya.
- Gondra Bustinza, J. (2008). Los sentimientos de inseguridad y miedo: El origen de una noción. *Revista Catalana de Seguretat Publica* 18: 93-104.
- Goodey, J. (2008). Targeted Victimisation Survey on Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities: Considerations for Comparative Research Development. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds.) (2008). *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium* (pp 16-33) 2007. Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Haymoz S., Aebi M.F., Killias M. & Lamon P. (2009). Comparisons of crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics in Switzerland. In Robert P. (Ed.). *Comparing Crime Data in Europe: Official Crime Statistics and Survey Based Data* (pp. 127-140). Brussels: VUBPRESS Brussels University Press.
- Heiskanen, M. (2006, January). *National Victimisation Survey in Finland*. Vienna: HEUNI. Meeting on Crime Statistics, Paper No 3.
- Heiskanen, M. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Heiskanen, M. and Piispa, M. (1998). *Faith, Hope, Battering. A Survey of Men's Violence against Women in Finland*. Statistics Finland: Justice 1988:20. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Heiskanen, M. and Piispa, M. (2008). Violence Against Women in Finland. Results from Two National Victimisation Surveys. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.136-159). Helsinki: HEUNI.

Hooghe, M. (s.d.): Social Cohesion Indicators for the Flemish Region. The Development of Comprehensive Social Cohesion Indicators at the Local Level in Flanders. Consulted the 28/04/2009.

http://users.Ugent.Be/~whardyns/SocialCohesionIndicatorsfortheFlemishRegion_WimHardyns.pdf

Hough, M. and Norris, P. (2008): *Comparisons between survey estimates of crime and crimes recorded by the police: the UK position*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.

Huls, F. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Instituto de la Mujer (1999, 2002, 2006). *Survey of Domestic Violence against Women*, Madrid, Instituto de la Mujer.

Irish National Crime Council. (2009). Consulted the 28/04/2009.

http://www.Crimecouncil.Gov.Ie/statistics_cri_victim.html

Istrate G. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Johnson, H., Ollus, N. and Nevala, S. (2007). *Violence Against Women: An international Perspective*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Johnson, H., Ollus, N., and Nevala, S. (2008). *Eliminating Violence against Women: Forms, Strategies and Tools*. Workshop presented at the Seventeenth Session of the United Nations Commission on crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Vienna: UNICRI. 14 April 2008.

Jones, T., MacLean, B. and Young, J. (1986). *The Islington Crime Survey: Crime, Victimization and Policing in Inner-City London*. Aldershot: Gower.

Kapardis A. (June 2009). Personal communication.

Karydis, V. (2004). *The invisible criminality. National victimological survey*. Athens-Komotini: A. Sakkoulas Publisher (in Greek).

Kellens, G., Peters, T. and van Kerckvoorde, J. (1993), « L'enquête internationale de victimisations vue de Belgique », in *RDPC*, 825-839;

Kerezsi, K. (June 2009). Comunicación personal.

Killias, M. (1989). *Les Suisses face au crime: Leurs expériences et attitudes à la lumière des sondages suisses de victimisation*. Grösch: Rüegger.

Killias, M., Haymoz, S. & Lamon, P. (2007). *Swiss Crime Survey*. Berne: Stämpfli.

Killias M., Simonin M. & De Puy J. (2005). *Violence experienced by women in Switzerland over their lifespan: Results of the International Violence against Women Survey (IVAWS)*. Berne: Staempfli.

Kinsey, R (1984). *Merseyside Crime Survey: First Report*. Liverpool: Merseyside Metropolitan Council.

Lundgren, E., Heimer, G., Westerstrand, J. and Kalliokoski, A. (2002). *Captured Queen: Men's Violence Against Women in "equal" Sweden- a prevalence study*. Stockholm, Sweden: Fritzes Offentliga Publikationer. 2002.

Martinková, M. (2008). *Experiences of Czech Republic Citizens with Some Delicts Victimological Survey Results*. Consulted the 28/04/2009.

<http://www.Ok.Cz/iksp/en/docs/s339.pdf>

Martinková, M. (June 2009). Personal communication.

- Mayhew, P. and Van Dijk, J. J. M. (1997). *Criminal Victimisation in Eleven Industrialised countries. Key findings from the 1996 International Crime Victim Survey*. The Hague: WODC.
- Meil, G. (2005). Social Surveys on Domestic Violence Against Women in Spain. *Statistical Journal of the United Nations ECE* 22 (2005) 279–287 279 IOS Press.
- Michaels, T. (2007). *Crime and Victimisation in Luxembourg: results of the European Crime and Safety Survey. Based on the data of the European International Crime Survey*. EU ICS Working Paper Series: Gallup Europe.
- Muratore, M. G. (2004). *Italian survey on violence against women*. Paper presented at the Work Session on Gender Statistics. Geneva 18-20 October 2004.
- Muratore, M. G. (June 2009). Comunicación personal.
- Muratore, M. G. and Corazziari, I., (2008). The New Italian Violence against Women Survey. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds). *Victimisation Surveys in Comparative Perspective*. Helsinki : HEUNI.
- Muratore, M. G. and Tagliacozzo, G. (2008). The Italian National Victimization Survey. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds.), *Victimization Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp. 100-121). Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Nevala, S. (2005). *Violence against women: a statistical overview, challenges and gaps in data collection and methodology and approaches for overcoming them*. Paper for the expert group meeting organised by UN Division for the Advancement of Women the Economics Commission for Europe (ECE) and World Health organisation (WHO). Geneva, Switzerland, 11-14 April, 2005.
- Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (2009). Northern Ireland Crime Survey. <http://www.csu.nisra.gov.uk/survey.asp62.htm> (consulted: 25 November 2009).
- Obergfell-Fuchs, J. (2007). *Crime victims and insecurity surveys in Germany*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP7 Workshop on Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys, Barcelona, March 15 – 17, 2007.
- Obergfell-Fuchs, J. (2008a). *Comparing crime data of different sources – the German situation*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.
- Obergfell-Fuchs, J. (2008b). Les Enquêtes sur la Victimation et l'insécurité en Allemagne in Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 105-126). Paris : L'Harmattan.
- Pauwels, L. and Pleysier, S. (2007). Crime Victim and Insecurity Surveys in Belgium and the Netherlands. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP7 Workshop on *Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys*. Barcelona, Spain, 15-17 March, 2007.
- Pauwels, L. and Pleysier, S. (2008). Victimes de Délinquance et Insécurité: les enquêtes en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas in Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 41-65). Paris : L'Harmattan.
- Police fédérale belge (1997-2006). Moniteur de Sécurité. Brussels: Police fédérale belge. http://www.polfed-fedpol.be/pub/veiligheidsMonitor/monitor_fr.php
- Police Grand-Ducale (2007). *Sentiment d' Insécurité au Luxembourg*. Presse release of 25 July 2007. Luxembourg : Sondage TNS IIRes.

- Raldúa Martín, E.V. (1996). Cambios en la imagen pública de la policía (1980-1995) y situación actual. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 74: 327-341.
- Recasens i Brunet, A (2008). Les enquêtes de victimation en Péninsule Ibérique. In Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp. 147-164) Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Robert, Ph. (2005). *Audit sur les enquêtes de Victimisation en Catalogne*. Centre d'Estudis de Seguretat. Secretaria de Seguretat Publica. Departament d'Interior Generalitat de Catalunya.
- Robert, Ph. (2007). *Research on Victimisation and Insecurity in France*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Workshop on Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys. Barcelona, Spain. 15-17 March 2007.
- Robert, Ph. (2008). Enquêtes françaises sur la Victimation et l'insecurité. In Zauberman, R. (Eds.). *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 89-103). Paris : L'Harmattan.
- Robert, Ph., Zauberman, R., Névanen, S., and Didier, E. (2008). L'Evolution de la délinquance d'après Enquêtes de Victimisation, 1984-2005. *Déviance et Société*, Vol. 32, No 4, 435-472.
- Römkens, R. (1997) Prevalence of Wife Abuse in The Netherlands: Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Survey Research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 99-125 (1997).
- Sacchini, G. (2008). *Comparing Police data and Victimisation survey in Italy*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.
- Sacchini, G. and Selmini, R. (2007). *Research on Vistimisation and Insecurity in Italy*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP7 Workshop on Crime Victims and Insecurity Surveys, Barcelona, March 15 – 17, 2007.
- Sacchini, G. and Selmini, R. (2008). La Recherche sur la Victimation et l'Insécurité en Italie. In Zauberman, R., (Eds.) *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages* (pp 127-146). Paris : L'Harmattan.
- Shury, J., Speed, M., Vivian, D., Kuechel, A. and Nicholas, S. (2005). *Crime against retail and manufacturing premises: Findings from the 2002 Commercial Victimisation Survey*. Home Office Online Report 37/05. London: Home Office.
- Schütt et al. (2008). *Dating violence in Denmark*. English Summary. Copenhagen: National Institute of Public Health. Consulted the 28/04/2009. http://www.si-folkesundhed.dk/upload/english_summary-dating_violence_in_denmark.pdf
- Siemaszko, A. (2009). Personal communication.
- Smit P. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Smith, D.J. (1983). *Police and People in London: A Survey of Londoners*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Spinellis C.D., Chaidou A., Serassis T., (1991). Victim theory and research in Greece. in Kaiser G., Kury H., Albrecht H. J., *Victims and criminal justice*, Freiburg: 123-159.
- Stangeland, P. and Guzmán Muñoz, E. (1996). La delincuencia contra comercios. *Boletín Criminológico* 18.
- Stangl, W. (June 2009). Personal communication.

- Sparks, R.F. (1981). Surveys of Victimization: An Optimistic Assessment. *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* 3: 1-60.
- Sparks, R.F., Genn, H.G. and Dodd, D.G. (1977). *Surveying Victims: A Study of the Measurement of Criminal Victimization*. Chichester / New York / Brisbane / Toronto: John Wiley and Sons.
- Statistics and Research Branch of the Northern Ireland Office (2009). The Northern Ireland Crime Survey Report. <http://www.nio.gov.uk/index/statistics-research.htm/> (consulted: 25 November 2009).
- Stoyanov, A. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Tavares, C. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Thomas, G. (2007). Development of a EU victimisation Module. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds.) (2008). *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007*. Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Thomas, G. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Töyrä, A. (2008). The New Swedish Crime Survey-Aim, Contents and Results. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.85-99). Helsinki: HEUNI.
- UNDP - United Nations Development Programme (1998). *National Human Development Report - Bulgaria 1998: The State of Transition and Transition of the State*. Sofia: UNDP.
- UNECE-UNODC (2004-2006). Inventory of CrimeVictim Surveys. Versions 4, 5, and 6.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M., Manchin, R., Van Kesteren, J. and Hideg, G. (2007). *The Burden of Crime in the EU, a Comparative Analysis of the European Survey of Crime and Safety (EU ICS 2005)*. Brussels: Gallup Europe.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M. and Mayhew, P. (1992). *Criminal Victimization in the industrialised word. Key findings of the 1989 and 1992 International Crime Surveys*. The Hague: Ministry of Justice, Department of Crime Prevention, Netherlands.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M., Mayhew, P. and Killias, M. (1990). *Experiences of Crime across the World. Key findings from the 1989 International Crime Survey*. Deventer: Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M. and Steinmetz, C. H. D. (1980). *The RDC victim surveys 1974-1979*. The Hague: Ministry of Justice. (Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Justice, 35).
- Van Dijk, J. J. M. and Terlouw, G. J. (1996). An International perspective of the Business community as victims of fraud and crime. *Security journal*, 7, 157-167.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M. and Toornvliet, L. G. (1996). Towards a Eurobarometer of public safety. Key findings of the first survey on public safety among the residents of the European Union. Report presented the 21-22 November at the *Seminar on the Prevention of Urban Delinquency linked to Drugs Dependence*. Brussels, Belgium. European Commission.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M., van Kesteren, J. and Smit, P. (2007). *Criminal victimisation in International Perspective. Key findings from 2004-2005 International Crime Victim Survey and the European Survey of Crime and Safety (EU ICS 2005)*: Onderzoek en beleid, No. 257. Ministry of Justice, WODC.
- Van Dijk, T. and Langerak, R. (2009). *Pilot data collections ICVS-2: Results and conclusions*. The Netherlands: Auteursrecht voorbehouden. Intomart GfK.

- Van Kesteren, J. (2003). The International Crime Against Business Survey. In Transparency International (Ed.). *Global Corruption Report 2003* (pp. 314-316). London: Transparency International.
- Van Kesteren, J. N. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Van Kesteren, J. N., Mayhew, P. and Nieuwbeerta, P. (2000). *Criminal victimisation in seventeen industrialised countries. Key-findings from 2000 international Crime Victim Survey*. The Hague: WODC.
- Walker, A. (2008). The British Crime Survey: the Experience of Measuring Crime over 25 years. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. (eds.), *Victimisation Survey in comparative Perspective. Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2007* (pp.122-127). Helsinki: HEUNI.
- Watson, D. (2000) *Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland: Results from the 1996 Survey*. ESRI/ Oak Tree Press.
- Wittebrood, K. (2008). *Comparing Crime Data in The Netherlands*. Paper presented at the CRIMPREV WP 7 Seminar on Studies comparing crime data based on general population surveys with criminal statistics. Barcelona, Spain. 11-13 September 2008.
- WODC (2008). *Monitor Crime in the Business Sector (MCB) (2007)*. Management Summary 31 January 2008 (pp.274-290). Amsterdam: WODC.
- WODC (2006). *The Monitor Victims of Human Trafficking (2006)* Woerden and Utrecht (The Netherlands): Adviesbureau Van Montfoort and the Verwey-Jonker Instituut.
- Wolf, P. and Hauge, R. (1975). Criminal Violence in Three Scandinavian Countries. In *Scandinavian Studies in Criminology*, vol. 5. London: Tavistock.
- Zarafonitou, C. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Zauberman, R. (Eds.) (2008a). *Victimation et insécurité en Europe. Un bilan des enquêtes et de leurs usages*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Zauberman, R. (2008b). *Assessing Deviance, Crime and Prevention in Europe. Surveys on Victimation and Insecurity in Europe*. Paris: CRIMPREV.
- Zauberman, R. (June 2009). Personal communication.
- Zvekic, U. and Alvazzi del Frate, A. (1995). *Criminal Victimisation in the developing World*. United Nations publication No 55. Rome: UNICRI.